PELICAN BOOKS

PUBLISHED BY PENGUIN BOOKS

A HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH PEOPLE IN 1815

(3)

ÉLIE HALÉVY

COMPLETE UNABRIDGED

R.D. Weeks
Ipswich House
Ashton under Hill
Worcs

PELICAN BOOKS

EDITED BY V. K. KRISHNA MENON

Advisory Editors; H. L. BEALES, Reader in Economic History, University of London; W. E. WILLIAMS, Secretary, the British Institute of Adult Education; SIR PETER CHALMERS-MITCHELL, C.B.E., F.R.S., F.Z.S., DR.SC., LL.D., Secretary of the Zoological Society 1903—1935

A HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH PEOPLE IN 1815

BOOK III: RELIGION AND CULTURE

770c

NOTE

This volume consists of BOOK III (RELIGION AND CULTURE) from Volume One of the original edition. BOOK I (POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS) and BOOK II (ECONOMIC LIFE) have already been issued in this series. This completes Volume One. The remainder of the work will follow, each Book in the original edition making one Volume in Pelican Books.

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

Readers not already on our mailing list who would like to know when new books are added to the Pelican Series, should write their name and address on a postcard, and post it to Penguin Books Ltd.

Suggestions for new titles are welcome.

PELICAN BOOKS

A HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH PEOPLE IN 1815

BY

ÉLIE HALÉVY

BOOK III: RELIGION AND CULTURE

PUBLISHED BY
PENGUIN BOOKS LIMITED
HARMONDSWORTH MIDDLESEX ENGLAND

First published in English 1924
Published in Pelican Books 1938

MADE AND PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN FOR PENGUIN BOOKS LIMITED
BY PURNELL AND SONS, LTD. PAULTON (SOMERSET) AND LONDON

CONTENTS OF BOOK III

CHAPTER I

PAGE

RELIGION 11

The Two Fundamental Forms of English Protestantism: The Church and the Sects—The Influence of Methodism on the Church of England—The Evangelical Movement—The Jews—The Scottish Presbyterians—The Catholics—The Question of Catholic Emancipation.

CHAPTER II

FINE ARTS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE 111

The Fine Arts—Drama and Literature—The Cultivation of the Natural Sciences—Educational Institutions—Voluntary Organization of Scientific Activity—Natural Science—Political Economy—The Utilitarian Philosophy—Conclusion.

BIBLIOGRAPHY 221

INDEX 277

A HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH PEOPLE IN 1815

BOOK III: RELIGION AND CULTURE

RELIGION AND CULTURE

THE religious institutions of the United Kingdom were no less intricate and confused than the political. The Established Church in England and Ireland was Episcopal, in Scotland Presbyterian. Of the subjects of the British Crown the majority were Protestant, but there were 4,000,000 Irish Catholics. Of the Protestants the majority were adherents of the Established Churches, but 2,000,000 belonged to free groups, whose organization was more or less republican. In the 17th century this diversity had been a source of disorder, even of anarchy. Was it the same during our period? Or amid so many conflicting currents was one influence predominant, and did it make for peace? If so, what was that influence?

England was not only remarkable for its intense religious life. It was also a country which could boast of a high level of culture—artistic, literary, philosophic. It possessed a school of first-rate painters, and the greatest poets the age produced anywhere in the world. Dalton, Davy and the Herschells were scientists of world-wide renown. The English philosophers and economists amazed Europe by the boldness with which they applied to the study of Man the accepted methods of the Natural Sciences. Did this development of culture take place in the teeth of the dominant religion? Or here, too, can we discover a conciliatory influence at work? Had the opposing forces concluded a compact of peace, tacit or express; and if so, on what terms?

During the 18th century England had been the scene of a great religious movement, unparalleled on the Continent—the last Protestant movement which has given birth to permanent institutions. This was the "Methodist" or "Evangelical" revival. To this movement, in combination on the one hand with the old Whig political traditions, on the other with the new *ethos* produced by the industrial revolution, British Liberalism of the opening 19th century owed its distinctive character. We shall witness Methodism bring under its influence, first the dissenting sects, then the establishment, finally secular opinion. We shall attempt to find here

the key to the problem whose solution has hitherto escaped us; for we shall explain by this movement the extraordinary stability which English Society was destined to enjoy throughout a period of revolutions and crises; what we may truly term the miracle of modern England, anarchist but orderly, practical and businesslike, but religious, and even pietist.

CHAPTER I

RELIGION

THE TWO FUNDAMENTAL FORMS OF ENGLISH PROTESTANTISM: THE CHURCH AND THE SECTS

The Methodist Revival.

It was in the year 1739 that John Wesley and George Whitefield began to preach Methodism. It was a period of general disturbance. A political was aggravated by an economic crisis. On all sides there were strikes and riots. Similar conditions a half-century later must have given rise to a general movement of political and social revolution. In 1739 the revolt assumed a different form. The discontented workmen flocked to the sermons of three clergymen and their disciples. The popular ferment took shape as an outburst of enthusiastic Christianity. But what doctrinal novelty did the two Wesleys and Whitefield proclaim to the English people? Anglican clergymen deeply attached to the Established Church, their sole aim was her defence and regeneration. This they sought to attain by reviving the venerable Protestant dogma of justification by faith. Despite the radical depravity of his nature, man was capable, since his Saviour's death, of sudden illumination by grace. It was for the Christian preacher by his eloquence to make himself the instrument of the Divine Will, to stimulate "conversions" in the sense that Protestant theology understands the term, to procure for his hearers an immediate sense of holiness, a certainty of salvation. At first the founders of Methodism preached in the churches, at Bristol, at Newcastle, in London. Later, when the clergy alarmed by their eccentric style of preaching and by their doctrinal extravagance forbade them the use of their churches, they preached in market-places and in the open fields. Their audiences numbered ten, fifty, even eighty thousand. Driven from the Anglican Church, and carried away by the very enthusiasm which they had excited, they drifted almost unconsciously into the sphere of the dissenting sects. It

was on the frontier of the Church of England that Wesley founded the vast organization of Methodism.[1] Thus the old establishment and the existing Free Churches constituted the double environment in which the new spirit was developed. And it is only when we are acquainted with this environment that we can understand the character and estimate the importance of the Methodist revival.

The Church of England.

The Church of England, or, to call it by its official title, the "United Church of England and Ireland," was a complex institution, a patchwork. Her apologists might say of the Church what Bishop Jebb said of her liturgy—that it "is not the work of one man, of one society, or of one age: it is like the British Constitution, a precious result of accumulative and collective wisdom."[2] The ritual of the Church of England had retained many features of Catholic ritual; but in obedience to long-established prejudices her unwritten constitution prescribed for the national worship the nakedness of Lutheranism or Calvinism. Moreover, her creed as formulated in the thirty-nine articles is to all appearance unadulterated Protestantism. At first sight the organization of the Church conformed to the Catholic type. In England there were two archbishops and twenty-six bishops, in Ireland four archbishops and twenty-seven bishops. But these princes of the hierarchy and their subordinates had alike discarded celibacy. Monasteries and convents had disappeared, as it seemed, for ever. Archbishops and bishops were direct nominees of the Crown: capitular election was a legal fiction, a mere registration of the royal choice. The ordinary clergymen, the parochial representatives of the archbishops or bishops, were for the most part nominated, not by the episcopate, but by the Crown or lay patrons. Convocation, a species of ecclesiastical parliament, with an archiepiscopal president, an Upper House of bishops, a Lower House of representatives of the inferior clergy, after losing under Henry VIII the right to revise the canons of the Church, under Charles II the right to fix clerical taxation, for a century had ceased altogether to meet. The King, acting on the advice of Parliament, was the supreme head

[1] For the causes of the success of Wesley's preaching in 1739, see the author's study, *La Naissance du Méthodisme en Angleterre*, *Revue de Paris*, 15 Août–1 Septembre, 1906.

[2] *Thirty Years' Correspondence between John Jebb and Alexander Knox*, vol. i. p. 368.

of a religion in which, to employ the accepted terminology, the "Erastian" principle, was scrupulously respected, a religion essentially national, whose source was the will of the secular government.

Of what character should we expect to find a clerical body thus constituted? England was probably the sole country in Christendom where no proof of theological knowledge was exacted from candidates for Ordination. These were all drawn from the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge; and neither of these Universities possessed a special organization for the teaching of Christian doctrine. At Oxford theology was reduced to one single question asked of all candidates for examination. At Cambridge no theology whatsoever entered into any of the examinations for a degree. The entrance examination once passed, and it was elementary in the extreme, not to say childish, students, who were not the eldest sons of gentle families, and did not possess sufficient industry or capacity to face more difficult examinations, could proceed without further delay to the clerical status. It is true that to hold any benefice, episcopal ordination was indispensable, and that ordination involved a preliminary examination by the bishop or his chaplain, whose object was, or was supposed to be, to discover the candidate's intellectual and moral endowments. But, as all the world knew, this examination was a mere formality. "A few minutes' conversation or examination, which either good nature or pity or interest or carelessness, or all together, may render very slight, can never make the diocesan thoroughly acquainted with the literary, much less with the moral, character of the intended minister."[1]

It is, therefore, no matter for surprise that the clergy of the national Church of England were intellectually inferior to the clergy of the Established Churches of Protestant Germany. How could any serious criticism of the Scripture text be expected from men who did not even know their Bible? At the beginning of the 19th century Marsh brought back from Leipzig some results of the German Higher Criticism, a theory of the composition of the Gospels, namely the hypothesis of a lost Protevangelium, from which our Four Gospels have been derived. Jebb was contemporaneously engaged in the study of Hebrew prosody, discovered as a result of new rules of rhythm, and utilized his knowledge of these to elucidate a few obscure passages in the New Testament. And this was all, or almost all.

If, however, the Anglican clergymen lacked scientific

[1] Cockburn, *Strictures on Clerical Education*, 1809, pp. 14–15.

curiosity, neither were they possessed by a fanatic zeal for orthodoxy. In the 18th century the High Church party was far more a political than a theological party. The High Churchmen were Tories who supported the Royal Prerogative and denounced rebellion as sinful. To be sure they inclined to Arminianism, to the doctrines of free will and justification by works, but this was due to their abhorrence of the republican opinions held by the Calvinists. For their part, the Low Churchmen, in their antipathy to the Church of Rome, might oppose to the Catholic doctrine an orthodox Calvinism. But in the 18th century the Low Church tradition, which dated from William of Orange and his Whig bishops Burnet, Tillotson and Stillingfleet, was latitudinarian. Throughout the century the sermons of Anglican preachers, whatever their party, though most markedly among the Whigs, kept the miraculous character of Christianity as far as possible in the background. Their religion was a liberal and rationalistic Christianity, a system of humanitarian ethics in which the supernatural was left out of sight. The goal of this direction of Anglican opinion was the book published by Paley in 1785 in which he identified Christian with utilitarian ethics, and presented Jesus Christ as the first teacher of the greatest happiness principle. Nevertheless, the members of the Church continued with little scruple to subscribe the thirty-nine articles which formulated the fundamental articles of Anglican belief. Those who in 1772 petitioned Parliament for release from this obligation merely betrayed a doctrinal scrupulosity of very doubtful taste. The attempt failed; and why regret its failure? The material point was that nobody was obliged to believe the thirty-nine articles or even to read them.[1]

The remedy that should have been applied, was to reform, or more truly to organise, the theological education of the clergy. But Anglican opinion was opposed to this step. In 1809 Cockburn proposed the introduction of Christian theology into the Cambridge course of studies. But he was

[1] Consider how Gisborne (*Duties of Man*, vol. ii. pp. 28–9) interprets the obligation to subscribe the articles: "In subscribing the thirty-nine articles the intention of the authority which prescribes subscription is to be satisfied. This authority is not the Legislature of the 13th Eliz. which passed the Act imposing subscription, but the existing Legislature of this country which, having the power of repealing that Act, and forbearing to exercise it, ratifies and, as it were, re-enacts the law. The point, therefore, which the candidate for Orders has to decide is the nature of the subscription which will satisfy the intention of the Legislature existing at the time?

content to ask for the adoption of the system in force at Oxford, namely a theological question in every examination. For, he adds, "that divinity should not be the exclusive, nor perhaps the principal, employment of such young persons is reasonable, because men of all professions and ranks are at that period educated together; future Peers, future senators, lawyers, physicians, clergymen, etc., are all fellow students at the same lecture; and, as it would be absurd to make them all study physic exclusively, so it would be wrong to make divinity the sole object of their common attention."[1] As for making theology the special study of the minority of students destined for Orders, Cockburn does not even contemplate the idea. Above all things clergymen must be gentlemen; and to secure this it was of the first importance that they should receive the education which all English gentlemen received. The Anglican clergy was, and was anxious to remain, a branch of the aristocracy.

Consider first the higher clergy. It was universally admitted that the choice of archbishops and bishops must be political. For the last thirty years the Tories had enjoyed an almost uninterrupted tenure of power. Consequently the two archbishops and almost all the bishops were Tories.[2] Eleven in 1815 were of noble birth, among them the Archbishop of Canterbury, a Manners and a cousin of the Duke of Rutland, and the Archbishop of York, a brother of Lord Vernon. Ten had been tutors or schoolmasters of a prince, a duke or a statesman. The Bishop of Lincoln, Tomline, successively tutor, secretary and biographer of Pitt, is a typical representative of this category. Two prelates, Thomas Burgess, Bishop of St. David's, and George Huntingford, were personal friends of Lord Sidmouth. And the see of Sodor and Man was actually a benefice in the heriditary patronage of the Dukes of Athol. It was but the natural result that the present occupant, George Murray, should be a member of the family. The Irish episcopate was equally aristocratic. Three archbishops and eight bishops belonged to influential families. One family alone, the family of Beresford, occupied three sees.

Let us now turn to the lower clergy—the deans, the canons, the archdeacons; and the ordinary parish priests—the parsons.

[1] Cockburn, *Strictures on Clerical Education*, p. 17.

[2] Horsley was the only bishop who died during the Fox-Grenville Ministry; but it was the Grenville group that designated his successor, a Tory (Lord Holland, *Memoirs of the Whig Party*, vol. ii. 90–1).

Wherever their appointment was in the hands of the archbishop or the bishop, he was careful to distribute his patronage among his clients and relatives. And first among the latter, since the Anglican hierarchy was married, were his sons and sons-in-law. But the extent of the patronage exercised by the episcopate was inconsiderable. Out of the 11,700 benefices of England and Wales, the patronage of scarcely 1,500 belonged to the bishops or cathedral chapters.[1] The English reformation found the religious orders predominant among the clergy, and in the vast majority of parishes a religious order was perpetual rector, and enjoyed the exclusive right to appoint the "vicar," who was the actual parish priest. With the dissolution of the monasteries their parochial patronage was transferred either to the colleges at Oxford and Cambridge, to the public schools of Eton and Winchester and to the cathedral chapters, since all these bodies were the direct heirs of former religious houses, or to the Crown, or to the families of the great landowners. To this latter class belonged 5,700 benefices. Hence in one-half of the parishes the appointment of the vicar was in the hands of the landlord, his legal and incontestable right. And even when the appointment lay with the Crown the Government often found it difficult to resist the pretensions of the gentry. The landowner of the parish whose vicar was to be appointed demanded that the Crown should give effect to his choice.[2]

Thus did the ecclesiastical constitution of the country harmonize with the political. The landed gentry were masters equally of the ecclesiastical as of the civil administration. Nepotism, the vice of aristocracies, found full scope, and was aggravated by pecuniary interest. The sale of benefices by public auction was a normal occurrence. The highest bidder could purchase either the immediate enjoyment of the benefice, if there was then a vacancy, or the right to the next presentation. The sums offered were advertised in the newspapers, which informed the public of the value of the benefice and the age of its present occupant. For the older the clergyman in possession the higher was the sum that could

[1] *Black Book*, 1820, p. 311.

[2] Twiss, *Life of Lord Eldon*, vol. i. p. 390. In the same work are to be found a number of letters by Lord Eldon, which throw an entertaining light on the manner in which ecclesiastical appointments were made. See especially vol. i. pp. 388–9 (Lord Eldon to Reay, September 8, 1801), and vol. iii. pp. 465–6. See also a letter from Lord Eldon to Rose, 1801 (*Diaries and Correspondence of . . . George Rose*, vol. i. pp. 376–7).

be obtained for an advowson whose enjoyment could not be long delayed.[1]

Whether he owed his living to favour or had purchased it in the open market, there was nothing whatever of the "priest" about the English clergyman. Should a young man of good birth, or simply the son of a respectable or wealthy family, enter the Church or the Army? Circumstances, parental caprice, often chance decided his choice.[2] While the war lasted, the Army offered a better opening.[3] Peace came and the Church beheld once more a stream of candidates for Ordination. Crowds of military parsons, as Cobbett termed them, descended on the country parsonages, and combined the stipend of their living with the half-pay of retired officers.[4] Only too often, apparently, the scion of a good family regarded a vicarage as the means of closing an irregular youth. We hear, for instance, of a gentleman who on leaving the University squandered in town a considerable portion of his estate: he married a clergyman's daughter and took Orders. And we are told of another who, when plunged in debt, disembarrassed himself by a living in Suffolk. "Here he became a great favourite with the country gentlemen, by whom his society was much sought; for he kept an excellent hunter, rode well up to the hounds,

[1] See the typical examples of these advertisements in T. Timpson, *British Ecclesiastical History*, pp. 500–1. R. Hodgson in his *Life of Porteus* (pp. 142–4) describes some curious devices current in the 18th century by which the advowson could be made to yield a maximum profit.

[2] Jane Austen, *Sense and Sensibility*, chap. xix: "We never could agree in our choice of a profession. I always preferred the Church, as I still do. But that was not smart enough for my family. They recommended the Army. That was a great deal too smart for me." *Pride and Prejudice*, p. 16: "A military life is not what I was intended for, but circumstances have now made it eligible. The Church ought to have been my profession. I was brought up for the Church, and I should at this time have been in possession of a most valuable living had it pleased Mr. Darcy (the patron)."

[3] Overton (*English Church in the 19th Century*, p. 149) quotes from a charge of Bishop Kaye, of Lincoln: "In consequence of opportunities of employment in the Army and Navy afforded to young men during the war, the number of candidates for Holy Orders was not equal to the demand for curates. During the first ten years of this century the number of young men who annually graduated as B.A. in January at Cambridge averaged little more than a hundred; it now (1852) averages more than three hundred."

[4] *Rural Rides*, September 23, 1826; October 11, 1826. For these ex-soldiers turned parsons, see Wakefield, *Ireland*, vol. ii, pp. 475–6.

drank very hard. He sang an excellent song, danced remarkably well, so that the young ladies considered no party complete without him." After further vicissitudes and further pecuniary difficulties we find him possessed of a substantial benefice—"by which he was enabled to launch again into the gay world."[1] The utmost that could be expected of clergymen thus recruited, was to avoid scandal and to behave as honourable gentlemen farmers. In any case, it was essential that they should be well paid. They belonged to good society, and usually possessed a wife and family. Even if their stipends were considerable, it was all they could do to support their social position. It is certain that the Anglican clergy were a heavy charge on the nation. But an exact estimate of their cost is difficult to reach. It is not easy to arrive at a fixed or an accurate valuation of incomes composed of the rental value of the parsonage, the rent of glebe land, and the tithe. In 1810 Cove estimated the total annual revenue of the Church as exceeding £2,900,000.[2] But the *Black Book* of 1820 estimates it at £5,000,000,[3] and later around 1832 there were critics of the system whose estimate was £9,000,000.[4] We may adopt the official figure reached in 1833 by a commission appointed for the purpose, the figure of £3,500,000, intermediate between Cove's estimate and the estimate of the *Black Book*. But no total estimate of this kind can give a sufficient idea of the stipends actually received by individual clergymen.

The Archbishops of England and Wales inclusive of the Bishop of Sodor and Man enjoyed a total income of £181,631. But whereas the income of the Archbishop of Canterbury and of the Bishop of Durham exceeded £19,000, and the income of the Bishop of London exceeded £15,000, the Bishop of Rochester had to be content with £1,500, and the Bishop of Landaff with a bare £900.[5] The total income of the parochial clergy was £3,250,000. But it would be of little use to attempt to form a notion of the English parson's

[1] Gunning, *Reminiscences of Cambridge*, vol. ii. pp. 62, 65 and 156.

[2] Cove, *An Essay on the Revenues of the Church of England*, 3rd ed., 1816, pp. 106, 109, 124. Incomes of bishops, £130,000; of deans and chapters, £276,000; of the parochial clergy, £2,557,202. Total, £2,962,202.

[3] *Black Book*, p. 310.

[4] H. of C., April 10, 1833, Lord Althorp's speech (*Parl. Deb.*, 3rd series, vol. xvii. p. 273).

[5] *Report of the Commissioners . . . into the Ecclesiastical Revenue*, 1835, pp. 6, 30, 95 † 40. Gross yearly income, £3,663,218; net yearly income, £3,373,389.

income by simply dividing this figure by the number of livings. The average so attained would mean very little. For the income of 4,000 livings, over a third of the whole number, did not exceed £50, and of these 4,000 poor livings, there were 1,726 where the income ranged between £100 and £150, 1,061 where it did not exceed or fall below £150.[1] Must we draw the conclusion that the organization of the Anglican Church was chaotic, or even stigmatize it without qualification as a system that favoured some of the clergy at the expense of their fellows? In reality, these official figures are often deceptive; for the clergy, to eke out stipends admittedly insufficient, had built up an entire system, which custom had sanctioned, of accumulative benefices, or pluralities.

One incumbent could hold simultaneously two, three, four, or even more benefices. There is an instance of a single ecclesiastic in possession of eight.[2] How, then, were these combined parishes served, since they were thus dependent on the spiritual care of a single man? The rector or vicar (for the vicar of one parish could be rector of another and vice versa, and either, indeed, might even be a bishop or archbishop) appointed a curate at a low stipend, and took the rest of the income for himself. From the parishes of Wetherale and Warwick the Dean and Chapter of the see received tithe to the value of £1,000 per annum, and an equal sum in rents. They paid a curate £50. From Hesket in the Carlisle Diocese the Dean and Chapter received annually between £1,000 and £1,500. They paid their curate £18 5*s.* or a shilling a day,[3] that is less than the pay of a workman paid by the day. These curates were in the true sense the inferior clergy of the Church of England—her plebs. To gain a livelihood for wife and family they were often obliged to become farmers,[4] and apologists of the sytem sought to console them for the extremity to which they were reduced by classical allusions and quotations from Cicero: *nihil agricultura homine libero dignius.*[5] Occasionally they sought their bread and butter from occupations even more "illiberal."

[1] Cove, *An Essay on the Revenues of the Church of England*, 3rd ed., 1816, p. 118.

[2] T. Timpson, *British Ecclesiastical History*, p. 506.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 507.

[4] H. of L., June 18, 1810, Lord Harrowby's speech (*Parl. Deb.*, vol. xvii. pp. 752 sqq.). The entire speech is a very interesting picture of the condition of the clergy.

[5] Cf. *Edinburgh Review*, January 1805, No. 10, Art. 3, *Observations on the Residence of the Clergy* (vol. v. p. 301).

A speaker in Parliament mentions in 1806 the case of a curate turned weaver.[1] Thus was reproduced in the administration of the Church an abuse we have already witnessed in the civil government of the Kingdom. Every position is regarded as its holder's sinecure. The actual duties are performed by a deputy—paid with a portion only of the emolument.

When the pluralist was not a corporation but an individual, and when the parishes from which he derived his income were not too far apart, he would not even appoint a curate. Alone he provided as best he could for the spiritual needs, to be sure extremely simple, of the faithful of his two or three parishes. Every Sunday morning he would gallop from church to church and hurry through a service shortened by himself for the purpose, and which he would make even shorter on days when he was more than usually pressed for time. If it was raining too hard he did not put in an appearance. No one was the least surprised. Dr. Drop, they said, was taking the service that Sunday. If he noticed that one of his churches lacked a congregation he shortened his Sunday round by omitting the service. But he did not omit the stipend. In country parishes Holy Communion was celebrated only three or four times a year—at Easter, Christmas and Michaelmas. In the dilapidated churches, no better than empty barns, the children of the village played their marbles, the beadles hatched out their chickens.[2] Even the pocket boroughs of the political franchise were paralleled by pocket rectories. Cobbett, in the course of one of his rural rides, remarked a Wiltshire parish which was simply an ecclesiastical Old Sarum. The parson's income amounted to £300 a year. There was neither church nor parsonage. Whenever a new parson was to be inducted, a tent was erected on the site, where the parish church had once stood, and in that tent the ceremony of induction was performed.[3] So scandalous had the abuse of non-residence become, that public opinion was roused and a series of official inquiries were made which enable us to measure its extent. Out of 11,000 livings there were over 6,000 where the incumbent was non-resident.[4] Of the 3,998 livings whose income

[1] H. of C. April 25, 1806, Wilberforces' speech (*Parl. Deb.*, vol. vi. p. 925).

[2] For these abuses see Overton, *English Church in the 19th Century*, pp. 127 sqq. Also Gunning, *Reminiscences of Cambridge*, vol. ii. pp. 149–50.

[3] Cobbett, *Rural Rides*, September 29, 1826.

[4] 4,506 in 1804–5, 4,132 in 1805–6, 6,145 in 1806–7; but we are informed that the difference is due only to more accurate statistics.

did not exceed £150 in 2,438 the incumbent was non-resident.[1] These inquiries, it must be remembered, were confined to England and Wales. In Ireland the vast majority of livings were obviously sinecures; for scarcely a sixteenth part of the population was Protestant, and by no means all Protestants were members of the Established Church. Nevertheless, that Church was established on precisely the same footing as if the entire population made use of its services. Here the scandal was not that the parsons neglected their flocks, but that the country was burdened by the expense of this enormous ecclesiastical establishment devoid of adherents.[2]

The churches actually in existence were empty; and a clergy devoid of conscientiousness or zeal had an interest in their remaining empty. Their work was the easier. But even had they been all filled, they would certainly have been insufficient to hold even a small minority of the population of England. Since 1688 neither Bishops nor parsons had given a thought to the need of adapting the system to the increase of population and its altered distribution. Therefore the distribution of bishoprics and parishes was treated in the same fashion as the distribution of constituencies. Formerly but half the province of York had been inhabited; now great centres of industry were being rapidly multiplied. But it still counted only six bishops as against twenty in the province of Canterbury, and 2,000 parishes for 10,000 in the Southern Province. Bath, Chichester, Ely and Hereford possessed their bishops; Manchester, Leeds, Birmingham, and Liverpool had none. The total church accommodation in Liverpool amounted to but 21,000 seats. The population

---

See *Abstract presented to the House of Commons of Returns relative to the Clergy*, 1808, 6,210 in 1807–8; see *Abstract of Returns respecting Residence and non-Residence for the Year ending March* 25, 1808. 1809: 7,298 for 1808–9; see *Abstract of the Number of Resident Incumbents and of the Number of Resident Incumbents according to the Diocesan Returns for the Year* 1810. 1812: 6,311 in 1812; see *Abstract of the Number of Resident and Licensed Curates, with the Amount of the Salaries of Curacies, according to the Diocesan Returns for the Year* 1811. 1813.

[1] *An Abstract of the Returns respecting non-Residence for the Year ending 25th of March*, 1808, *including only Livings under the Value of* £150 *per Annum*, 1810.

[2] H. of C., March 13, 1806, Grattan's speech (*Parl. Deb.*, vol. vi. p. 429). "In many parishes of Ireland there were no parishioners to whom the clergyman could minister; and therefore, it must be totally unnecessary to enforce the residence of an incumbent, so long as a parish continued to be so circumstanced."

was 94,000. In Manchester there was accommodation for 11,000 of the 79,000 inhabitants. In London the Established Church provided about 150,000 seats for a population that exceeded a million.[1]

An Act of Parliament had indeed been passed in the reign of Anne to provide for the erection of fifty churches in London;[2] but its execution had been neglected. During the entire course of the century, despite the unexpected increase of the population, only ten churches were erected in the capital. To be sure any Englishman who chose might open a place of worship; but the Anglican service must not be used. If he wished to erect an "episcopal" chapel, he was faced with endless difficulties. Tithe-payers were apprehensive of an increase in their burdens on the appearance of a new clergyman. The noble patrons of the existing churches had no desire for a new church which by its competition with the other livings would reduce their market value. The Duke of Portland compelled the parish of Marylebone, with a population of 40,000, to be content with a village church with accommodation at the utmost for 200.[3] But if the Church of England could neither obtain for her faithful a more diligent clergy nor a better provision of churches, what must be the inevitable result? Either the population would be exposed to revolutionary influences, anti-clerical and hostile to religion (fear of this result was an increasing pre-occupation in conservative circles towards the end of the 18th century; they could not fail to remark the rapid dissemination of Tom Paine's deistic and "Jacobin" writings in the poor quarters of the large towns) or the inertia of the Anglican clergy would be a valuable asset to the preachers of dissent. But from the professional standpoint of the Anglican clergy this latter prospect—a country religious indeed but alienated from the official worship, the established religion threatening to become the creed of a minority, the nation disposed to adopt the American system of free churches —was a prospect as little reassuring as the former.

The abuses were crying. Yet public indignation was slow

[1] Overton, *English Church in the 19th Century*, pp. 144–5.

[2] 9 Anne, cap. 22.

[3] *British Review*, May 1803, Art. 21, *An Address to the Parishioners of St. Pancras, Middlesex, on the Subject of the intended Application to Parliament for a new Church*, by T. F. Middleton, D.D., London, 1812 (vol. iv. pp. 370 sqq.). Cf. September 1811, Art. 4, *The State of the Established Church in a Series of Letters to the Right Honourable Spencer Perceval, Chancellor of the Exchequer*, 2nd ed., 1810 (vol. ii. pp. 96 sqq.).

to awake. And even when in the opening years of the 19th century there grew up a powerful movement of democratic opposition directed against Governmental abuses, administrative scandals, the unfair system of parliamentary representation, the oppressive taxation, critics displayed an amazing forbearance towards the Church. Already for the past fifteen years the system of tithes had been the subject of severe criticism in Parliament. It was now a question freely discussed whether the tithes should not be "commuted" for a fixed money payment. But it was in Ireland, not in England, that the population revolted against the tithe. The Irish complained that their tithes were payable on arable land only, not on pasture, with the result that the entire burden rested on the poor cotter, while the wealthy cattle-breeder paid nothing. They complained that they were levied by middlemen, that the proctors who farmed the tithe paid the clergyman a lump sum and made their fortune by squeezing the peasants dry. And Catholics and Presbyterians complained of their obligation to support the episcopal worship.[1] In England these abuses did not exist. No doubt the farmers had reason to complain of an impost which discouraged agriculture, was levied solely on land, and bore indiscriminately on Anglicans and members of other religious bodies. But it was equally true that the vast majority of English farmers belonged to the Established Church, that in England ever species of land was equally subject to tithe, and that the proctors were non-existent.[2] And as we have already seen, the English farmers were not, like the Irish tenantry, members of the proletariat. They were capitalists leagued with the landlord against the labourer, in a position, moreover, to dictate their terms to their landlord, and when the leases were renewed to shift the payment of tithe on to his shoulders.[3]

The other abuses, non-residence of vicars, the miserably inadequate stipends of curates, were already being remedied, not under the pressure of a party in arms against clerical

[1] On the question of the Irish tithes, see especially a long and interesting debate in the Commons, April 13, 1810 (*Parl. Deb.*, vol. xvi. pp. 658 sqq.). It is noteworthy that throughout the discussion no mention is made of the English system unless to contrast it favourably with the Irish. See also Wakefield, *Ireland*, vol. ii. pp. 469 sqq.

[2] Cove, *An Inquiry into . . . a Commutation of Tithes*, 1800, pp. 23, 50, 51.

[3] It was therefore the landlords, united on the Board of Agriculture, who in England demanded the commutation of the tithe. See above, Book II, chap. i.

oppression, but, as we shall see, to satisfy the demands of that section of the Church which under the influence of Methodism was seeking to strengthen the hold of the clergy on the masses. Take it all in all, the nation was tolerant of a clergy, apathetic indeed, and worldly, but little disposed to play the tyrant. Statesmen of both parties were agreed in their appreciation of a system under which the priests did not constitute an order marked off from the rest of the nation but were men of their own class, their relatives and friends, intimately bound up with the life of county society. Even a democrat like Cobbett, an avowed enemy alike of the Crown and the aristocracy, and a violent opponent of the Methodists, had not yet in 1815 declared war on the parish clergy.

The Dissenting Sects.

The Anglican Church found herself faced by the sects of Nonconformity. They were termed "Nonconformists" because their members refused to conform to the ritual and the discipline of the Establishment, "Dissenters," because of their doctrinal disagreement with the Church. Presbyterians, Independents, Baptists, the "three old denominations" agreed in pronouncing the hierarchical government of the State Church unscriptural. Their own constitutions were more democratic. The laity received a larger, sometimes even a preponderant, share in the government of the society. The fundamental doctrines of English Nonconformity were the theological principles of St. Paul, as revived by Luther and Calvin. Man is justified not by works but by faith; and faith is regarded not as an activity of the soul, but as a state in which the soul is completely passive, a gratuitous gift, a work of grace, that is to say, of the Divine Will. That Will omnipotent, and inscrutable in its infinite excess of our understanding, has ordained everything in the universe, good and evil alike, and from all eternity has predestined a minute handful to salvation, the mass of mankind to damnation. Grace constitutes between the Creator and His creature an immediate and an intimate relationship, whose establishment does not require the mediation of a priest, who, if perhaps capable of pronouncing on works, is powerless to estimate the presence of faith. This theological individualism had constituted no small factor in the republicanism of the Cromwellians. How much of it survived among the eighteenth-century Dissenters in the period preceding the Methodist revival?

Let us examine first their legal position. After a century of religious warfare in which the enemies of Anglicanism had been in turn the oppressor and the oppressed, even the Revolution of 1688 had failed to establish a system of complete religious toleration. The Episcopal Church continued to be the national Church, and those marriages alone were legal which had been solemnized by her ministers. The Corporation Act[1] and the Test Act[2] remained in force and continued, as under the Stuarts, to make communion according to the Anglican rite the indispensable preliminary to municipal honours or Government offices. And Acts even more oppressive, such as the Conventicle Act[3] and the Five Mile Act[4] continued on the Statute Book. The former of these Acts prohibited all gatherings of above five persons for the celebration of any form of worship other than the Anglican. Infractions of the law were punishable by fines, imprisonment and deportation, even, for a second offence, by death. The latter forbade any clergyman who had failed to take certain oaths expressing his acceptance of the Anglican form of church government to reside within five miles of any borough or of any place in which he had formerly ministered. But a number of customs and legal enactments, without formally repealing these intolerant statutes, had rendered them inoperative.

The Toleration Act declared that the provisions of the Conventicle and Five Mile Acts should not apply to anyone who should repudiate papal authority by taking the oaths of "allegiance and supremacy," and should affirm his Protestantism by signing the declaration against Transubstantiation. Independent and Presbyterian ministers were required to subscribe thirty-five of the thirty-nine Anglican Articles. They were not required to maintain that the Church has power to ordain rites and ceremonies, that the homilies contain a godly doctrine, that the ordination service is neither superstitious nor idolatrous. Baptist ministers were required to subscribe only thirty-four articles. They were not required to maintain that infant baptism is a laudable custom.[5] And means had been found to evade the Corporation Act. The

[1] 16 Car. II, cap. 1.
[2] 25 Car. II, cap. 2.
[3] 16 Car. II, cap. 4.
[4] 17 Car. II, cap. 21.
[5] William and Mary, St. 1, cap. 18. To satisfy their conscientious scruples the oath demanded from dissenting ministers was further simplified in 1799 (19 Geo. III, cap. 49). See Bogue and Bennett, *History of Dissenters*, vol. iv. pp. 159 *sqq.*

Dissenters made use of a method termed "occasional conformity." Once and once only they received communion in accordance with the Anglican rite, and having thus rendered themselves capable of taking part in local government they returned to their Conventicles. Among the sects this custom gave occasion to scruples of conscience. On the other hand, it aroused the protests of the stricter Anglicans, protests which had even resulted in the passing in 1711 of an Act which rendered occasional conformity illegal. But in the end the practice was universally accepted, and every year Parliament passed an Indemnity Act which contained a collective pardon for all breaches of the Act of 1711 during the past year. And although about 1790 the Dissenters conducted a zealous propaganda for the repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts, they were, on the whole, well satisfied throughout the 18th century with the system of semi-legal toleration by which in practice they enjoyed absolute freedom.

But under this system of tolerance the primitive inspiration of Nonconformity began to evaporate. The cessation of religious persecution produced a decline both of uncompromising dogmatism and enthusiastic devotion. We have already remarked the extent to which the national Church displayed its indifference to questions of dogma. To this apathy the Dissenters responded by an equal indifference. Their activities became rather political than religious. They possessed in London a General Committee, "the Committee of the Three Denominations," entrusted with the defence of their political interests and legal rights.[1] There were special coffee houses where the ministers and leading adherents of their different sects learned to know each other and to discover their affinities. All this was neither particularly theological nor particularly religious. But these political ministers were by no means ignorant men. On the contrary, they appear to have often excelled the higher Anglican clergy in intellectual capacity and in the extent of their erudition. Those among them who were attached by the bonds of Ordination, sometimes even by ties of kindred to the clergymen expelled in 1662, regarded themselves as a religious aristocracy. The "seminaries" or "Academies" which they founded, and which the High Church party vainly endeavoured to close, were famous for the solid education which they imparted. Even members of the Established Church sent their children to these Academies.

[1] Ivimey, *History of the English Baptists*, vol. iii. pp. 196, 198 204.

in which Peers, even Bishops, had received their education. But this attempt to attract to their schools pupils of every rank of society, made it a point of honour with the ministers to be free from fanaticism and narrow attachment to dogma. The orthodoxy of Dissent was in rapid decay.

It would seem that the eighteenth-century Dissenters, or those at least whose task was the guidance of consciences, were ashamed of the extravagant and savage features of the Calvinistic creed. Their theologians were increasingly less disposed to give an unreserved assent to the dogma of predestination, or to maintain man's absolute impotence to effect his salvation by his own free will. There was a universal rally to the doctrine of transaction defended by Baxter in the 17th century. But was Baxter's doctrine, strictly speaking, Calvinism? At least it must be represented as such, unless the Dissenters were prepared to abandon their opposition to the philosophy of free will, to the "Arminianism" of the Catholics and the Anglican High Church party. And Dissenters were soon found who dared to go beyond even "the modified Calvinism" of a Watts and a Doddridge. The General Baptists separated from the Particular Baptists, because they maintained that Jesus died not for the elect alone, but for all men without exception.

Nor did this theological criticism confine its opposition to the doctrine of grace. It attacked the belief which seemed to be the fundamental doctrine of Christianity, the common faith of all Christians, the doctrine of the Trinity. Semi-Arianism, Arianism, naked Socinianism—such was the parallel development of thought in the Anglican Church and among the Dissenters. Two Anglicans, Whiston and Clarke, were the first to pronounce the symbol of Nicea untrue to the primitive Christian tradition. The Gospels, they maintained, teach us that there is but one God only, that the person of Jesus is not consubstantial with the person of the Father, that Christ is a created Divinity, no older than the universe of which He is the Saviour.[1] Outside the pale of the Establishment James Peirce put forward opinion scarcely less categorical. He was condemned by the assembly of Nonconformist ministers, as Whiston and Clarke had previously been condemned by Convocation.[2] But the

[1] Hunt, *Religious Thought*, vol. iii. pp. 13 sqq.

[2] See especially *The Western Inquisition; or a Relation of the Controversy which has been lately among the Dissenters in the West of England*, by James Peirce, London 1720. Cf. Ivimey, *History of the English Baptists*, vol. iii. pp. 160 sqq.

heresy gained ground. At the close of the century the Anglican Lindsay, and the Presbyterians Price and Priestley, went even further than Whiston, Clarke and James Peirce. They refused to admit in Jesus even a divinity of subordinate rank. They regarded Him as no more than a man who enjoyed an intimate union with God, and was endowed with the gifts of prophecy and miracle-working. This revived Socinianism was known henceforward as Unitarianism, to distinguish it from the orthodox Trinitarianism, and the influence of Price and Priestley infected with the novel heresy well-nigh the entire Presbyterian body. But when the traditional creed had been thus stripped of every feature which in the religion of Israel had been a stumbling-block to reason, and at the same time of every speculation which had been elaborated by Greek theology to enrich the simplicity of the primitive monotheism, what was left of Christianity?

We must not, however, imagine that these heterodox thinkers, Semi-Arminians, Arminians, Unitarians, were representative of the entire body of Dissent. The sects continued to contain a mass of adherents of the lower middle class attached to the old beliefs and ready to discover and denounce the doctrinal deficiencies of their ministers. But their "high Calvinism" which regarded the "low Arminianism" of their fellows as an error scarcely less abominable than Deism itself assumed forms which endangered the health of Dissent.

In the first place the Antinomian tendency continued in active operation and constituted for Dissenting ministers a cause of constantly recurring troubles. So long as Christianity has existed and will continue to exist sects have been and will be found to interpret its teaching in the sense of anarchy. Did not St. Paul say that "to the pure all things are pure"? Good works, then, are evil, radically evil, and therefore of no avail for salvation. Those who have received the gift of grace, concluded the Antinomians, have received not the power to conform their actions more exactly to the moral law, but, on the contrary, a revelation that the moral law has no existence. The result of such doctrine was the open practice of free love, and a number of small disorders whose prevention, restraint and eradication required ceaseless labour.

And the "hyper-Calvinism" of the sects assumed other forms which, if less scandalous, were more dangerous. If salvation is a gratuitous gift of God, and of God alone, it is not permitted to a man to convert his fellow-men. A

minister named Brine developed this thesis,[1] and gave rise to long controversy on the point among the Independents and the Baptists.[1] "Christ and his apostles," exclaimed Fuller, an opponent of Brine and his followers, "without any hesitation, called on sinners to 'repent and believe the Gospel,' but we, considering them as poor, impotent and depraved creatures, have been disposed to drop this part of the Christian ministry. Some may have felt afraid of being accounted legal; others have really thought it inconsistent. Considering such things as beyond the *power* of their hearers, they seem to have contented themselves with pressing on them things which they *could* perform, still continuing the enemies of Christ; such as behaving decently in society, reading the Scriptures and attending the means of grace. Thus it is that hearers of this description sit at ease in our congregations. Having done their duty the minister has nothing more to say to them—unless, indeed, it be to tell them occasionally that something more is *necessary* to salvation.[2]"

In any church where it established a footing this Quietism destroyed every species of missionary activity. It was, indeed, Moslem pride, not Christian zeal. The faithful were conscious of being the Saviour's elect. It was their privilege, perhaps also the privilege of their children, to whom the Redeemer had granted a peculiar opportunity of salvation by ordaining their birth in an elect family. All around them surged the mass of unbelievers and idolators. But this was only to be expected. For nature was corrupt and the elect few. Here and there a solitary individual would be saved not by human efforts but the incomprehensible operation of Divine Grace and would be added to the elect. All the rest we must pass over in disdain, and adore the Lord's Will. Thus while in one quarter the progress of criticism undermined the authority of the traditional dogmas, in another these dogmas assumed an increasing fixity. The Calvinism of the former party was undergoing decomposition, the Calvinism of the latter petrifaction.

But in both cases alike Dissent lost all capacity for propaganda. And there were further causes of weakness at work, due to the organization of the sects. The principle on which English Dissent was organized was the congregational or

[1] *A Refutation of Arminian Principles delivered in a Pamphlet intituled the Modern Question concerning Repentance and Faith, examined with candour . . . in a Letter to a Friend*, by John Brine, 1743. Cf. Ivimey, *History of the English Baptists*, vol. iii, pp. 270 sqq.

[2] Andrew Fuller, *The Gospel Worthy of all Acceptation* (1781), pp. 143 sqq.

"independent." Every little group that chose to constitute itself a separate body enjoyed a strict autonomy. Once constituted the tiny community accepted no outside control, and any attempt to combine the groups of the same denomination in a centralized organization was considered the initial admission of the principle of ecclesiastical authority, the first step towards Popery. In these little independent groups the pastor was not in the eyes of his flock the representative of any authority human or divine superior to themselves; he was no more than their agent, their paid officer. In this Baptists and Independents were entirely agreed. They differed on one point only—the question of baptism which the Independent administered to infants by aspersion, the Baptist to adults by immersion. And although in principle the English Presbyterians accepted like their Scottish brethren a more hierarchical system, their common struggle with the Church of England had brought them into so intimate a connexion with the Independents and Baptists that they had inevitably been affected by their beliefs. Hence arose among these little religious communities, whose organization was thus democratic, even anarchic, a series of disputes and intrigues of which those brought up in the bureaucratic traditions of Roman Catholicism can scarcely form a conception.

If the pastor happens to incur the displeasure of a particular group among his congregation, a coterie or an influential family, he is at once the victim of a persecution. He is represented as an ignoramus—his sermons, it is declared, have been learnt by heart from some old collection of homilies. He is accused of immoral living, and indeed may perhaps have been guilty of some levity or imprudence, at the place where he preaches or in some remote village, eight days or ten years earlier. He is accused of heresy. Is he a Calvinist, an upholder of the Protestant dogma of justification by faith? It is an easy matter to accuse him of teaching Antinomianism, corrupting youth, preaching free love. Are his opinions more temperate and is he inclined to "moderate Calvinism"? Then he must certainly believe in free will and must be an Arminian—that is to say, a heathen. If he is a man of education and good family he may even in the end seek refuge in the Church of England, whose hierarchical constitution would remove him from the control of the laity. Or possibly schism breaks out in the community. A section declares itself for the pastor denounced by the others and forms a separate congregation. In that case a flourishing community is replaced by two bodies, each miserably poor, and scarcely capable of supporting a pastor.

The result of all this was the wretched economic situation of the ministers which was the object of universal complaint among English Dissenters in the 18th century. Throughout this period the prices of all commodities had risen, salaries and wages were tending to a proportionate increase, but the stipends of ministers were sometimes even lowered. The congregations whose duty it was to support them were too small, and belonged to the lower middle class, were farmers or shopkeepers with the shopkeeper's parsimony. The average salary of a minister fell below £60 a year, often below £40, sometimes even £30.[1] But it was impossible on such an income to maintain respectably a wife and family, to insure against sickness and disablement, to provide for the support of widow and orphans in case of death. And the absence of any central fund compelled the individual minister of every congregation to settle these problems for himself and out of his own resources.

But the organization of the Dissenting communities was not after all quite so simple as it has been described above, and this fact gave rise to further complications and fresh intrigues.

There was a constant tendency for a division to be established within each local group between the "Church," namely those believers who were particularly zealous in the performance of their religious duties, who received Communion regularly, had been "converted," and had borne public testimony to their reception of grace; and the "congregation," the lukewarm members who paid for their sittings in the chapel, and who, though not remarkable for religious zeal, wished nevertheless to hear a sermon every Sunday.[2] Thus the community was composed of two bodies compelled to establish a mutual *modus vivendi*. And the less fervent were often the wealthier whose help was indispensable for the payment of the minister, the repair of the buildings and the relief of the poor.

Yet another problem must be faced. The law obliged the congregations to put their places of worship into the hands of trustees. These trustees, chosen normally from the influential members of the congregation, became in quiet times rulers of the association of which they were the legal representatives. Thus the little religious democracy degenerated into a plutocracy. If difficulties arose between the pastor and a section of his flock, the pastor's safest policy would be an alliance with the trustees in opposition perhaps to the will

[1] *Protestant Dissenters' Magazine*, vol. iii. (1796), p. 68. Cf vol. ii. (1795), pp. 119, 156, 292; vol. iii. (1796), p. 143.

[2] S. T. Porter, *Lectures on the Ecclesiastical System of the Independents*, p. 69.

of the majority. What could the malcontents do? Go to law? They were ignorant of the terms in which the deed of settlement had been drawn, and whether the trustees had not taken advantage of the obscurity of legal jargon to arrogate in correct legal form powers which those for whom they had acted had never intended to bestow. And even if their legal position were unassailable, they did not know how much time and expenditure a lawsuit would cost.[1] In very many instances they yielded or seceded. In the locality where the dispute had taken place Dissent was discredited. Its adherents lapsed either to Anglicanism or, what was practically the same thing, to religious indifference.

An Established Church apathetic, sceptical, lifeless; sects weakened by rationalism, unorganized, their missionary spirit extinct. This was English Protestantism in the 18th century. And in 1815 it still presented in several respects the same spectacle although Methodism had been long at work and its action had changed profoundly the old order. On the Church of England the action of Methodism was late and slow, on Dissent it had been rapid and radical. The Wesleyan preaching had regenerated Nonconformity, creating new sects and transforming both the spirit and the organization of the "old denominations."

The Rise of Methodism: Its Influence on English Nonconformity. The New Methodist Sects.

John Wesley, whose genius for organization equalled his genius for preaching, had founded under his despotic rule a skilfully organized "society." This society did not propose to break with the Established Church, and had no objection of principle either to her doctrine or to her discipline. In its founder's intention it constituted a species of lay third order,[2] whose mission was to complete the work of the clergy and to inspire the Church with the devotion of a genuine Christianity. Nevertheless, the Methodist societies found it

[1] For a good example of these internal disputes, see *Statement of some late Proceedings relative to the General Baptist Church at Nottingham*, 1817. On the question of trustees see John Blackwell, *Life of Alexander Kilham*, 1818, p. 88; *Protestant Dissenters' Magazine*, vol. iii. (1796), pp. 110 sqq.; S. T. Porter, *Lectures on the Ecclesiastical System of the Independents*, pp. 92, 101.

[2] Many Catholic religious orders (e.g. the Franciscans and Dominicans), beside their second order of nuns, possess a third order for men and women in the world, whose members are bound by rule to a higher standard of prayer and practice than is demanded of all Christians.—(TRANSLATOR'S NOTE.)

an impracticable task to remain in the position Wesley had desired—persistent in fidelity to a Church which repudiated them. Methodism stimulated the growth of new sects, and the first of these was the Wesleyan body itself.

The Methodist preachers were conscious of the influential position they occupied in their local groups. Why should they resign themselves to accept a position of humiliating inferiority to the Anglican clergymen who ignored or insulted them? Why should they not claim the same ecclesiastical privileges as were enjoyed by the Presbyterian, Independent and Baptist ministers around them? Why should they bind themselves never to administer the Sacraments to the faithful, never to hold their meetings during the hours when the vicar was gabbling through the Anglican service in the parish church? And around and beneath the preachers their lay-adherents made their complaints heard. In the same village they saw Baptist or Independents treat their ministers as their agents and exercise a constant control over their acts and opinions. Why should they not claim similar rights over their ministers? Why should they accept in the Methodist body the strictly subordinate position that had been imposed upon them by John Wesley, who was personally inclined to the principle of authority and sincerely attached to the hierarchical tenets of Anglicanism? The leaders of the movement hesitated. Disturbed by the violence and persistence of these demands they were nevertheless unable to arrive at an immediate conclusion as to the degree to which the interests of Methodism demanded concessions to the wishes whether of the ministers or of the laity.

To renounce their undecided attitude and to break openly with the Establishment was to sacrifice numerous advantages. The Wesleyan preacher did not demand from his convert a change of creed or church, but merely that he should learn under his spiritual direction a heartier love and a more faithful practice of the religion which he had professed from childhood. He did not, therefore, arouse at the outset of his work the suspicions which would have been excited had he been a minister of one of the old historic sects. But, on the other hand, to refuse the breach was to incur another danger. Nothing would then prevent Methodists determined to sever connexion with Anglicanism from leaving the Wesleyan body and joining the Independents or Baptists. Indeed this was actually happening, and if it became general would reduce Methodism to a recruiting ground for Dissent. First John Wesley himself, then his successors, were driven to adopt a policy of opportunism. They yielded to the advocates

of rupture where concession was inevitable, in principle as little as possible, but every day more and more. The rules continued to lay down "that the Sacrament of the Supper shall not be administered in the chapels." But they admitted exceptions in cases where the central or local authorities of the "society" should sanction it by a majority. It was only in certain cases clearly defined that the rules permitted the Methodist service during church hours, in direct rivalry with the service of the Establishment. But these cases were numerous. To render concurrent services licit it was enough that the parson was a man of notoriously immoral life, that he preached Arianism, Socinianism or any other doctrine equally pernicious, that the number of churches in the neighbourhood was insufficient for the population, that there was no church within a radius of two to three miles; or even that the authorities of the local group had decided by a majority of votes that such was the will of the people and would not result in a split within the society.[1]

A constantly increasing number of societies availed themselves of the permissions granted by the rules. Wesleyan Methodism formed itself into a sect, and with this new sect a new principle of organization made its appearance in the history of English Dissent. The Wesleyans expressly rejected the congregational system. To employ the formula of their own devising, they were connexionalists. They did not hold that each local society could be considered an independent church. All the local societies formed together one single "connexion" strongly centralized. Neither did they hold—for indeed the two principles are mutually inseparable—that the ministers are merely the elected servants of their congregations. The Wesleyan minister has received from God the gift of converting souls, and his preaching has proved his effective possession of that gift. The faithful cannot, therefore, by their votes for or against him confer or take away this miraculous endowment. And if, to discriminate between the truly inspired and the impostor, preachers must be subject to a controlling authority, that control can only be exercised by other inspired preachers, by those possessed of the mission to direct souls, not by those who have themselves need of direction.

The true unit of the Wesleyan organization was not the society but the circuit constituted by the union of a number

[1] All those conditions, except the last, were laid down by Wesley in 1786 at a meeting at Bristol (*Minutes*, vol. i. p. 189). The last is contained in the *Articles of Agreement for General Pacification*, adopted at Manchester in 1795 (*Minutes*, vol. i. pp. 322–4).

of societies. At the head of the circuit were placed under the authority of a superintendent two or three travelling or itinerant preachers who within the circuit journeyed from one society to another, detached from any, supervising all and preaching as the representatives of a higher authority. They were not even allowed to remain attached for any length of time to the same circuit. They could be moved yearly, they must be moved at least every second year. Thus the foundation-stone of the Wesleyan organization was the systematic denial of local autonomy. To be sure, if a local society built a chapel, it must inevitably possess the appointment of the lay trustees. But every precaution was taken to preclude the possibility that these trustees would make themselves owners of the chapel and revolt against the corporation which had entrusted it to them. And further, every local society possessed its special preachers, the local preachers, laymen who after their Sunday sermons devoted the remainder of the week to their professional occupations in field, shop or factory. It possessed also its lay treasurers, the stewards. And it was divided into little groups for the mutual edification of their members called classes, and each class had its head, the leader. But the class leaders, stewards and local preachers were chosen not by the congregation but by the superintendent of the circuit, and only after a long series of tests could a local preacher be promoted to the rank of a professional preacher. When every three months the circuit meeting was held, only the stewards and the itinerant preachers took part in it. Neither class leaders nor local preachers were admitted. Nor was the individual congregation or circuit free to fix the stipend of the preacher. In virtue of his position as a preacher of the Methodist connexion, he had the right to £12 a year for himself, £12 for the support of his wife, £4 for each of his children, £6 for the board and wages of a servant. If a circuit were too poor to pay its preachers the connexion must make up the deficiency. To conclude, the entire system represented the sacrifice of freedom to organization.[1] Of all the Free Churches the Wesleyan was the least free.

[1] *Methodist Magazine*, 1801, p. 370, *The Design and Rules of a Society for the Casual Relief, when in Distress, of Itinerant Preachers and their Families, in the Connexion of the late Rev. John Wesley, London, Instituted* 1799. A notice of 1801, however, informs us that some societies had raised their preacher's stipend from £12 to £16. In 1818 the central fund to make up the deficits of poor circuits amounted to £11,193 14*s.* 6*d.* (*Free and Candid Strictures on Methodism and especially its Finances*, by Valentine Ward, 1818).

Several circuits constituted a district, and the totality of districts was the connexion. How, then, was the central government of the sect organized? The central government was John Wesley himself, who, while he lived, exercised an undivided and despotic rule. He had thus created in the Methodist connexion a tradition of clerical authority not to be easily destroyed. He had even desired, when he established his first societies, to debar his lay helpers from preaching and from the administration of the Sacraments. The force of circumstances was too strong for these scruples of Anglican clericalism. In the end he had claimed for himself the episcopal power of Ordination. He had consecrated ministers to work in Scotland, in America, even in England itself. He had actually carried his pretensions so far as to consecrate Methodist bishops in America, though himself only a priest. But who after his death would succed to his authority? In 1784 he drew up a list of a hundred preachers who became the legal representatives of the entire body, in whose name the trustees held the buildings of the sect. Henceforward these men constituted as of right the Conference summoned every year by Wesley to deliberate on Wesleyan affairs. After Wesley's death what form of government would this senate of preachers, the Legal Hundred, establish?

They could have replaced Wesley by the government of a few preachers permanently invested with superior authority, and thus have instituted a Methodist episcopate. Dr. Coke, an Anglican clergyman on whom Wesley had conferred authority to exercise episcopal functions in America, and Mather, whom Wesley had ordained priest, were advocates of this policy. It satisfied their personal ambition, for they hoped to become the heads of the new hierarchy. But the jealousy of their colleagues proved an insurmountable obstacle. Neither was chosen president of the Conference for the year following Wesley's death, and lest the president should degenerate into a dictator his office was made annual. On the proposal of Mather and Coke the Conference agreed to organize under the name of districts administrative areas comprising several circuits, but it refused to place these districts under superintendents. Methodism should have no bishops. At the same time loud protests were raised against the composition of the Conference. The choice of the original hundred members had already been a source of bitter resentment among the excluded preachers, although Conference then exercised merely advisory functions, all authority being in the hands of Wesley. Now, however, when Conference had assumed all the power, executive and

judicial, formerly exercised by Wesley their discontent came to a head. Concessions were made. Henceforward deceased members would no longer be replaced by co-optation, but vacant seats would belong of right to the older ministers in order of seniority. The year 1814 witnessed a further innovation. Election by the body of preachers would henceforward be a factor in the composition of the Conference.[1] To this extent the equalitarian principle of the collective pastorate triumphed over the principle of episcopacy or of government by a co-opted assembly. But Conference continued to exercise an uncontrolled authority, and the laity were permanently excluded from all share either in its deliberations or in the choice of its members.

Thus the rude and fanatical preachers that Wesley had enlisted beneath his banner, not only continued to make converts after his death—there were 231,000 Wesleyan Methodists in 1813[2]—but created a skilful organization whose hierarchic character was in some respects almost Anglican and had been previously unknown among the Dissenting bodies. In matters of ritual also the Wesleyans were far less prejudiced against the practices of the Established Church than the members of the older denominations. They encouraged hymn singing against which the long-rooted prejudice of the Dissenters had persisted throughout the previous half-century. They would soon introduce organs into their chapels. Wesley had prescribed for use in their services either the Anglican liturgy or an abridgment of it drawn up by himself. In short, the Methodist connexion adopted a position intermediate between the Establishment and the older Nonconformist bodies. It thus constituted a transition between the former and the latter, which became

[1] The president and secretary were to be elected no longer by the Conference but by all preachers who had exercised their ministry for at least fourteen years. But at the same time, to prevent the Conference from becoming an assembly of greybeards, a return was made to the older method, and it was decided that one seat in four should be filled by co-optation (G. Smith, *History of Wesleyan Methodism*, vol. ii. p. 561).

[2] In 1815 the official figure for Great Britain, Ireland and the Colonies was 230,948. The increase for Great Britain and Ireland, which had been almost nil in 1803 and 1804, from 1806 onwards reached a yearly average of 8,000. In 1814, as the result of a great "revival" in Wales, it attained the exceptional figure of 12,009 (see George Smith, *History of Wesleyan Methodism*, vol. ii. p. 711). To arrive at the total of Wesleyan Methodists it would be necessary to include the Wesleyans in the United States, 211,129 in 1815 (George Smith, *History of Wesleyan Methodism*, vol. ii. p. 613).

the more insensible when new sects arose in turn from Wesleyanism and occupied the space between the Connexion and the original sects.

It was on doctrinal grounds that a section of the Methodists broke with the Wesleyan body. Wesley had adopted the paradoxical position of preaching justification by faith while rejecting the complementary doctrine of predestination. Whitefield had refused to divorce the two doctrines, and the Calvinism of his followers opposed the Arminianism of the Wesleyans. In 1811 in Wales Thomas Charles severed the last links connecting the Calvinistic Methodists with the Anglican Church. This secession possesses a peculiar importance in the religious history of Britain; for it has been estimated that only one-third of the inhabitants of Wales remained in the Establishment.[1]

But more usually it was a question of organization that gave rise to quarrels among the Methodists. On Wesley's death a preacher named Alexander Kilham demanded a democratic reform of the Wesleyan constitution. Expelled from the society, he founded in 1797 the New Methodist Connexion, in which the lay members of the local congregations played an active part in the conduct of worship and in the choice of ministers. In all the assemblies of the sect—Circuit Meeting, District Meeting, Annual Conference —ministers and laymen sat in equal numbers.[2]

In 1806, and the years following, two Staffordshire local preachers—William Clowes, a potter, and Hugh Bourne, a carpenter—organized in imitation of the American Methodists large religious meetings in the open air, known as camp meetings. These lasted for several days and inflamed to the highest pitch the imagination of the pious crowds which frequented them. The new Wesleyan bureaucracy met these camp meetings with the same opposition which the Church of England had formerly displayed to the open-air preaching of Wesley and Whitefield. The "Cloweses" formed them-

[1] R. Ayton, *Voyage Round Great Britain*, vol. ii. (1815), p. 71. According to statistics compiled in 1812 (*Abstract of the Total Number of Parishes containing a Population of* 1,000 *Persons and upwards; the Number of Churches and Chapels therein . . . and the Number of Dissenting Places of Worship therein*) there were in the diocese of Bangor 52 Anglican churches and chapels, 100 Nonconformist chapels; in the diocese of Llandaff, 21 Anglican and 42 Nonconformist places of worship. Figures are wanting for the diocese of St. David's. Cf. Bogue and Bennett, *History of the Dissenters*, vol. iv. p. 339.

[2] [John Blackwell] *Life of Alexander Kilham*, pp. 227 sqq., 269 sqq.

selves into a separate sect which in 1812 adopted the official title of Primitive Methodists. It continued to be governed by a central Conference; but the Conference was elected by the laity, and two-thirds of its members were laymen. Unlike the Wesleyan Conference, it did not assure a fixed stipend to all its ministers. Each circuit might fix what stipend it pleased. Nor did the conference hold itself responsible for debts contracted by a circuit for the construction of chapels. Yet another Methodist sect, the Bible Christians, was formed in 1818 on lines practically identical with Kilham's New Connexion.[1] These three new groups were examples of a type of constitution intermediate between the connexionalism of the Wesleyans and the congregationalism of the Independents and Baptists, and akin to the federal and representative Presbyterian system, as it had been devised by Calvin.

The Influence of Methodism on the Old Denominations.

The very existence of these new Methodist sects is a proof that the influence of Wesleyan ideas was not confined to the 200,000 members of official Wesleyanism. Wesleyan influence spread, in fact, even further than these sects, and penetrated all the Dissenting bodies; and everywhere it was a spirit of reaction against the rationalism and republicanism of the old Nonconformity. The dissenting sects of rationalistic tendency were decaying. When the French Revolution broke out, they were swamped by doctrines frankly anti-Christian. Paine, whose *Rights of Man* enjoyed an amazing popularity, was a Deist. The orthodox Utilitarian school, which from 1807 grew up in London around Bentham and James Mill, was radically irreligious, and endeavoured to prove that belief in God was not only a childish superstition but a dangerous error. Carlile and Hone had inaugurated, or were on the verge of inaugurating, an atheistic propaganda of a more popular and more vulgar type. Orthodox Protestants accused liberal Dissent, Wide Dissent as it was called, of paving the way to irreligion pure and simple; and they regained lost ground among the sects.

The history of the Dissenting bodies at the opening of the 19th century is the relation of an uninterrupted series of victories won by the Independents and Baptists who had remained orthodox over the Presbyterians who had gone

[1] For these different sects see Crothers, Rider, Longbottom, Townshend, Packer, *The Centenary of the Methodist New Connexion*, 1797–1897.

over to Unitarianism. A century earlier the Presbyterians had been the most important of the three old denominations. According to some calculations their numbers even equalled the combined total of Independents and Baptists. According to another reckoning they composed by themselves two-thirds of Dissent. Now they barely amounted to a twentieth part.[1] In every county the same spectacle was witnessed. The Arian or Socinian chapels are empty, often no longer used for worship; then the Independents appear on the scene, obtain from the negligent trustees possession of the buildings, preach orthodox Christianity; and once more large congregations fill the chapels. Thus it came about that in London where formerly the Presbyterians had been particularly numerous, in 1796 there were only fifteen Presbyterian congregations as against thirty-three Independent and eighteen Baptist, not to mention thirty Methodist congregations.[2] In Devonshire, the cradle of Arianism, twenty Presbyterian meeting-houses had been closed. In Hampshire, which had contained forty Presbyterian chapels in 1729, only two were left in 1812, and even these two were destined to disappear within the next fifteen years.[3]

The doom which befell the chapels where the liberal ministers preached befell also the seminaries, the Academies, which had been the boast of Latitudinarian Nonconformity. One by one they disappeared, and their place was taken by new schools of another type, orthodox and pietist. Two heterodox teachers, Dr. Kippis and Dr. Rees, taught at the Hoxton Academy. In consequence the school was compelled to close in 1785. It was united with the Academy at Daventry, where Belsham taught. But in 1789 Belsham went over to Unitarianism and resigned his position. Then the Daventry Academy was united with the Academy at Northampton, which the presence of Doddridge had once rendered famous. But this too was infected by Socinianism and in turn was closed in 1798 by the trustees. During these years Kippis and Rees were teaching at Hackney College, founded in 1786, where Belsham shortly joined them. After an existence of only ten years the College was closed. The unpopularity of French ideas, lack of discipline, financial mismanagement had combined to destroy it. The year 1811 witnessed a new attempt to found a Unitarian Academy.

[1] Bogue and Bennett, *History of the Dissenters*, vol. iv. pp. 329–30.

[2] *Protestant Dissenters' Magazine*, vol. iii. (1796), p. 433.

[3] *Congregational Historical Society, Transactions*, January 1904, vol. i. Part 2, p. 297.

After seven years' existence the new school also disappeared. Meanwhile at Hoxton, Hackney and Hitchin liberal Academies were replaced by new foundations where the education was orthodox and Evangelical, and these flourished. The same thing happened in the South-West of England. The Arian Academies of Exeter and Taunton were closed. Rival schools, founded by the Independents at Ottery St. Mary, by the Baptists at Bristol, prospered. In the North the Warrington Academy founded by Priestley, after moving in succession to Manchester and York, was finally closed.

Meanwhile the Baptists founded in Bradford, in 1804, the Northern Baptist Education Society. In twenty years' time its premises needed to be enlarged. In Wales, when the Caermarthen Academy went over to Arianism, the Independents withdrew their support and founded an Academy at Abergavenny.[1] But the new impetus which was pushing Independents and Baptists into victory had been imparted to them by the Methodists. The Methodist sects sent them a constant flow of recruits, and if they did not, like Wesley, repudiate Calvinism, and if it was from Whitefield's Calvinist connexion that they drew the majority of their converts, nevertheless their Protestantism was as remote from the cut-and-dried Calvinism of old-fashioned orthodoxy as from the semi-rationalism of a Priestley. There was no systematical theology, no discussion of doctrinal niceties. The Dissenters drew their members from the lower classes of the population; they were small shopkeepers, small farmers, artisans, agricultural labourers. The example of Methodism had led to the growth of private religious gatherings for the mutual edification of their members. In these a young man could distinguish himself by the fervour of his exhortation, or by the charm of his eloquence. More often than the others he would be called upon to pray or to preach. Admirers and friends would urge him to abandon his trade and enter the professional ministry. He might perhaps scarcely know how to read or write, and would enter one of the Academies of his denomination. This pompous designation concealed a very modest reality. For a low fee a minister took a few boarders, and taught them in the intervals of his preaching. His pupils assisted him and went out to preach in the neighbourhood. In their spare time they learnt Grammar and Spelling. Greek, Hebrew and Theology were out of the question. Dissenters of the old school sorrowfully admitted the intellectual deterioration

[1] For the details given in the text see Bogue and Bennett, *History of the Dissenters*, vol. iv. pp. 228 sqq.

of their ministers and congregations. "Now, when a vacancy happens, the great object is to find a man of popular talents, who will bring an increase of hearers to their meeting houses" . . . "a man who can make the most noise, or tell the most entertaining stories, or talk the most fluently without notes and without study."[1]

The new preachers were illiterate enthusiasts, versed only in the methods of that popular oratory which was best fitted to awaken in the assembled crowd a "revival" of religious feeling, an emotional or "experimental" Christianity. Man bears in the depths of his soul a primitive superstition, which neither science nor abstract theology can satisfy. The notorious Joanna Southcott would be the talk of London for months, because she had promised at the age of sixty-five to become the mother of a son of God.[2] Evangelical Nonconformity provided this appetite for the marvellous with a more spiritual food. They had no desire to overawe their hearers by physical miracles. Their aim was to convert souls. Nevertheless, among the most ignorant classes and in the wilder districts their preaching often produced strange effects. In Wales the members of the sect of "Jumpers," an offspring of Methodist revivalism, threw themselves flat on the ground when the sermon began. Soon they felt themselves inspired from Above, rose to their feet and jumped in time. An outbreak of collective hysteria had begun which might continue for hours on end.[3]

The influence exerted by the religious revival of the 18th century on the outlook of the old Nonconformist sects was manifested in yet other ways. From the beginning the Independent churches had made attempts to form local associations of greater or less extent without violating the principle of autonomy proper to their constitution. But these associations were loose in the extreme and never included all the churches of the denomination even in the district where they had been formed. They possessed no

[1] *Protestant Dissenters' Magazine*, vol. i. pp. 502 sqq. Cf. pp. 351 sqq.

[2] For the riotous scenes that accompanied the post mortem on Joanna's body, see the *Morning Post*, January 2, 1815. For Joanna Southcott, see *Edinburgh Review*, Dec. 1815, Art. 11, *Publications respecting Joanna Southcott* (vol. xxiv. pp. 452 sqq.).

[3] R. Ayton, *Voyage round Great Britain*, vol. ii. (1815), p. 71, describes scenes of this kind witnessed by himself at a large religious gathering which comprised 20,000 persons, held at Carnarvon in the September of 1814. The sect is noticed for the first time in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for July 1799 (vol. lxix. p. 579).

permanent character and amounted to nothing more than annual meetings for prayer in common and the exchange of religious "experiences" between the ministers. They had possessed no power to legislate for their constituent churches; indeed the statutes of the associations expressly prohibited any attempt of this kind. And among the Congregationalists even these Associations had practically ceased to exist by the middle of the 18th century. Among the Baptists, where they had continued to be a regular feature of the organization of the sect, they were viewed with suspicion, even by those who consented to take part in them. Nor did their distrust tend to disappear.[1] "We confess, brethren, we entered this association with great jealousy and caution; for although we clearly saw the practice of associating, consulting and mutually assisting in the purest ages of Christianity, yet we could not but recollect that such associations were in the end productive of the great anti-christian apostasy, an apostasy so fatal to the civil and religious liberties of mankind, and particularly to those of the brave old Puritans and Nonconformists, that the very words synod and session, council and canon, yet make both the ears of a sound Protestant Dissenter to tingle."[1]

But under the influence of Methodism this spirit of almost anarchic autonomy was soon to lose much of its primitive power. If Methodism made such rapid strides, if at each of their Annual Conferences the Wesleyans could publish statistics proving the enormous growth of their sects, this was obviously to a large extent the result of their superior organization. The itinerant preacher was obliged to a continual journey between the towns and villages of his circuit, and must visit not those places only in which congregations had already been established, but also, and indeed it was his first duty, those places where no Methodist had as yet preached. The Independent minister was, on the other hand, the representative of the congregation which had appointed him. To that congregation he belonged. Only with its authorization might he occasionally preach elsewhere. Thus the principle of absolute autonomy was a barrier to the progress of the sects which had adopted it. If missions were to be organized for the conversion of unbelievers, it was indispensable that the congregations should combine and send out the missionaries at their joint expense. And again, if the precarious financial position of the Nonconformist ministers was only too evident, here also the Methodist practice suggested the remedy. Why should not

[1] Ivimey, *History of the Baptists*, vol. iv. p. 40.

several congregations combine to form a common fund for the assistance of superannuated ministers, their widows and their children? Why should they not form associations which should do more than merely provide opportunities for mutual edification, which should centralize the finances of the sect?

The Congregationalists were the first to give way. In Lancashire in 1786[1] they founded a county association whose objects were to organize a system of itinerant ministers, and to secure their local ministers against indigence. The association prospered, and its statutes served as a model to the associations which within a few years had sprung up in all or almost all the counties of England. The Baptists followed the example of the Congregationalists. In June 1796 they organized an itinerant tour in Cornwall, in September of the same year a permanent system of itinerancy in Essex, and in the following year they established in London a central society for the encouragement and support of itinerant preaching.[2] Already in 1784 they had created a central committee, the Baptist Case Committee, to assist the construction of chapels in every part of the kingdom.[3] In 1816 they would found a Beneficiary Society for the Relief of Superannuated Baptist Ministers.[4] A more momentous step followed in 1812. After a series of difficult negotiations sixty churches united to form a Baptist Union which embraced the entire kingdom,[5] and although eighteen years had yet to pass before the Congregationalists would

[1] J. Waddington, *Congregational History*, 1800–50, pp. 110 sqq., and for the later history of the association, pp. 123 sqq. William Urwick, *Nonconformity in the County of . . . Cheshire*, p. 65, *Congregational Magazine*, 1841, *Supplement*, new series, vol. v. pp. 926 sqq.

[2] Ivimey, *History of the English Baptists*, vol. iv. pp. 67, 68. See the regulations of the society in the *Baptist Annual Register*, 1797, p. 465.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 178.

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 122–3.

[5] J. Waddington, *Congregational History*, 1800–50, pp. 125–6. *Evangelical Magazine*, 1806, pp. 234, 334; 1807, p. 286; 1808, pp. 34, 140, 272; 1809, pp. 86, 169, 302; 1810, p. 253. S. T. Porter, *Lectures on the Ecclesiastical System of the Independents*, Lecture 3, pp. 129 sqq. A Scottish union had been in existence since 1806. The *Evangelical Magazine* for 1796, p. 119, describes a Societas Evangelica whose object was to spread "the blessings of the Gospel by Itinerant Preaching," and which since its foundation in 1776 had expended the sum of £8,000. The society offered to co-operate with ministers or county associations, apparently without distinction of sect.

form a similar federation, the preliminary negotiations had already been set on foot.[1] To be sure these associations preserved a voluntary character, individual churches were always free to join or to refuse adherence, and the Associations had no power to bind by their majority vote the local congregations. But this leaves unaffected the fact that the necessity of meeting Methodist competition had won Congregationalists and Baptists to the warm support of a systematic organization hitherto unknown among them. They were not, indeed, converted to the connexionalist type of organization which prevailed among the Wesleyans; but they were tending towards a system akin to the old Presbyterian or Calvinist model, and to the system of those dissident Wesleyan sects described above.

Finally, for the reasons already mentioned, the progress of Methodism was tending to render the Protestant Dissenters political conservatives. As their interest in theological polemics had cooled, they had lost their old taste for discussion, their former love of argument. And as their prejudices in favour of ecclesiastical autonomy weakened, their individualism in politics weakened simultaneously. Intermediate between the sects in the strict sense of the word and the Established Church, Methodism filled the gap between these rival bodies. The Methodists, and especially the Wesleyan Methodists, although in fact Nonconformists, refused to regard themselves as entirely cut off from the Anglican Church. The members of the connexion admitted an obligation to communicate according to the Anglican rite when unable to communicate in one of their chapels; and their ministry claimed to be not the enemy but the assistant or the locum tenens of a clergy which neglected its duties. And the other sects were infected with the same

[1] With the Unitarians the question of organization did not assume the same form, since they were sprung from the Presbyterian Church, whose organization had always been more hierarchic than that of the other two old denominations. A Western Unitarian Society governed the West of England, a Southern Society London and the Home Counties, a Northern Society the newly developed industrial districts. This organization had existed from the foundation of the sect. But in 1806, in spite of their dislike for the methods of the Wesleyan preachers, which they condemned as crude, they had so far yielded to their influence as to form a Unitarian Fund whose objects were the encouragement of popular preaching and the dispatch of itinerant missionary preachers throughout the country. For this movement and Belsham's opposition to it see Belsham, *Memoirs of Lindsey*, pp. 308–9, and the *Evangelical Magazine*, 1807, p. 68.

spirit. During the first fifteen years of the 19th century only isolated and eccentric individuals among the Nonconformists demanded either a reform of the constitution of the national Church in conformity with their ideas, or disestablishment and equal rights for all denominations.

But for all this the division was not less clearly marked than formerly between the social classes from which the Establishment and the sects respectively derived their adherents. In some respects we might even say that the line of demarcation was drawn more rigidly than ever before. From the beginning Nonconformity had been the religion of the middle class and particularly of the lower middle class. Nevertheless, in the 18th century Dissenters sat in the House of Lords, and on occasion boys of noble family had received their education in the seminaries conducted by Nonconformist ministers. Now both these things had become an impossibility. Nor was the number of wealthy Nonconformist merchants on the increase. In the normal course the more wealthy Dissenters went over to the Church of England. If a successful man of business wished to enter the governing class, to entertain at his country seat the clergy or the gentry of the neighbourhood, to obtain a title or a position in the Civil Service, he must not be a Dissenter. The wealthy Dissenter, therefore, was only too ready to yield to the entreaties of his wife, herself perhaps the daughter of an "episcopalian" family, or of his sons, who were eager to see the family enjoy a social position in keeping with its wealth and with the education they had received. He would seize the first opportunity to pick a quarrel with his pastor or with one of the influential members of the congregation. He thus escaped the moral supervision exercised by the fellow members of his congregation, and which he had so often found galling, and attended the worship of the Established Church where there was no obligation of religious zeal, and where the squire was his fellow worshipper. Puritan nonconformity thus tended to become a transitional creed, a stage in the history of an English family. The unskilled labourer becomes in turn a skilled workman, an artisan, the head of a small business, a business man possessed of a modest capital, and as he rises out of the barbarism in which the working class was plunged, he becomes a Nonconformist. If he himself rises still higher on the social ladder, or if his children rise after his death, he or they go over to the Church of England.

Nor was there the slightest difficulty in effecting the transition from one form of religion to another. The con-

stitution of the Wesleyan body rendered the transition imperceptible. And what is most characteristic of the new spirit in Dissent is its acceptance of this subordinate position. The middle-class Nonconformist was content to be despised by the members of a Church which his own family might some day enter. He compensated himself by indulging an even deeper contempt for the common people of the fields or factories from whom his family had emerged.

Why was it that of all the countries of Europe England has been the most free from revolutions, violent crises and sudden changes? We have sought in vain to find the explanation by an analysis of her political institutions and economic organization. Her political institutions were such that society might easily have lapsed into anarchy had there existed in England a bourgeoisie animated by the spirit of revolution. And a system of economic production that was in fact totally without organization of any kind would have plunged the kingdom into violent revolution had the working classes found in the middle class leaders to provide it with a definite ideal, a creed, a practical programme. But the élite of the working class, the hard-working and capable bourgeois, had been imbued by the Evangelical movement with a spirit from which the established order had nothing to fear.

No doubt the English Nonconformists continued to oppose any movement towards bureaucracy. Without freedom of association they could not exist. But for all their freedom of theological difference the sects agreed among themselves and with the national authorities to impose on the nation a rigorous ethical conformity and at least an outward respect for the Christian social order. With their passion for liberty they united a devotion to order, and the latter finally predominated. Hence freedom of association proved in the end the restriction of individual freedom and the authority of custom replaced and almost superseded the authority of law. And this is modern England. On the Continent the leaders of the English labour movement are sometimes blamed for their middle-class morality and want of imagination, at others praised for their solid virtue and capacity for organization. Perhaps these qualities and defects are inseparable; in any case they derive from a common origin. The majority of the leaders of the great trade-union movement that would arise in England within a few years of 1815 will belong to the Nonconformist sects. They will often be local preachers, that is practically speaking ministers. Their spiritual ancestors were the founders of Methodism. In the

vast work of social organization which is one of the dominant characteristics of nineteenth-century England, it would be difficult to overestimate the part played by the Wesleyan revival.

We can watch between 1792 and 1815 an uninterrupted decline of the revolutionary spirit among the sects. During the first years of the war the Dissenters of rationalist and republican leanings were loud in the utterance of their beliefs. In 1792, when Price and Priestley by their imprudent declarations of republicanism had compromised the sect of which they were the luminaries, the aristocracy and the populace combined against it. Chapels were sacked, congregations dared not meet. Tory politicians and Anglican bishops were not slow to exploit the unpopularity of the democratic Dissenters to the detriment of Nonconformity as a whole. Canning in his *Anti-Jacobin Magazine* was unwearied in his denunciations. In every revolutionary he saw either a Dissenter or a former Dissenter or a friend of Dissenters. In the associations recently formed by the Independents and Baptists to organize an itinerant ministry he saw a scheme plotted by political societies to preach under the disguise of Christianity, republicanism, Deism, perhaps even Atheism.[1] Bishop Horsley of Rochester, in a famous charge, attacked the Methodists as conscious or unconscious agents of the Atheistic and Jacobin propaganda. What, he asked, was the true character of these religious or apparently religious societies which met every evening in the towns and country villages? of these fanatical and uneducated preachers? of this federation of religious congregations at the very moment when the federation of political associations had been declared illegal? "The Jacobins of this country, I very much fear, are at this moment making a tool of Methodism just as the illuminées of Bavaria make a tool of freemasonry; while the real Methodist, like the real Free-Mason, is kept in utter ignorance of the wicked enterprise the counterfeit has in hand."[2]

When, however, we investigate what actually was taking place in the Nonconformist bodies, we discover that such denunciations are not to be taken very seriously. The only congregations in which republicanism was predominant were the Presbyterian, precisely the least numerous and the least prosperous, and their Jacobinism was hastening their

[1] *Anti-Jacobin Review and Magazine*, July, November, December, 1798, vol. i. pp. 294, 590, 626, etc. Cf. *On the Welsh Nonconformists, Gentleman's Magazine*, September 1799, vol. lxix. p. 741.

[2] *Charge . . . to the Clergy of his Diocese . . .* 1800, p. 20.

decline. When in 1798 a Baptist pastor, the Rev. John Martin, declared in a sermon that, "should the French land, some, yea many, of these different and differing people" [the Dissenters] "would unite to encourage the French," the entire denomination was in arms. After a hasty inquiry Martin was expelled from the sect.[1] It is safe to say that the advocates of Revolution were the exception among the Baptists and Independents. Their most eloquent pastors denounced the political creed of Jacobinism. Robert Hall, Baptist preacher at Cambridge and a friend of Mackintosh, preached a famous sermon in 1800 attacking what he called Modern Infidelity. By this he understood the principles of the French Revolution.[2] The Congregationalist preacher William Bengo Collyer made himself famous in 1804 and 1805 by his patriotic sermons to the volunteers. The subscribers to his "Lectures on the Proofs of Scripture Truth" included Lord Grenville, Robert Southey and three Anglican bishops.[3] And all contemporary evidence agrees, that if the old Nonconformist denominations remained faithful to Whiggism, the vast majority of their members belonged to the right wing of the party.

When the anti-Jacobins made their charges universal and attacked the Methodist preachers, the injustice became scandalous, the calumny almost self-evident; for the sect was on principle conservative. At the time of the American War, when Price, Priestley and Wide Dissent as a body declared for the rebels, John Wesley had published two pamphlets, whose circulation extended to several thousands, to inculcate loyalty upon the colonists and the British public.[4] In 1792 the statutes of the Wesleyan body expressly demanded from their members, loyalty and obedience to the King and his Government. "None of us," ran their declaration, "shall either in writing or in conversation speak lightly or irreverently of the Government. We are to observe that the oracles of God command us to be subject to the higher powers; and that honour to the King is there connected

[1] Ivimey, *History of the English Baptists*, vol. iv. p. 77.

[2] Gregory, *A Memoir of . . . Robert Hall*, 1833, p. 109. Again in 1805 he delivered a series of patriotic addresses (Stoughton, *Religion in England . . .* vol. i. pp. 11–12).

[3] J. Waddington, *Congregational History*, 1800–50, pp. 136 sqq.

[4] *A Calm Address to our American Colonies*, 1775 (*Works*, vol. xi. pp. 76 sqq.). *Some Observations on Liberty occasioned by a late Tract*, 1776 (*Works*, vol. xi. pp. 86 sqq.). This was a reply to Price's pamphlet, *Some Observations on the Nature of Public Liberty*, etc. Cf. *Journal*, November 27, 1775, for a copy of Wesley's open letter to the *Evening Post*.

with the fear of God."[1] Such conduct ensured that in spite of the calumnies of writers and speakers among the supporters of the Government the unpopularity of Jacobin principles did not prejudice the Methodist propaganda. The new type of Nonconformity, evangelical and pietist, was gaining ground every year.

Progress of Nonconformity. The Act of 1812.

Nonconformity was making progress alike in the towns, the industrial districts, the country-side. It even made proselytes in the Army to the alarm of the officers.[2] Speaking in the House of Lords in 1810, Lord Harrowby prophesied the day when a majority of the nation would be Nonconformist.[3] There is no evidence available to determine the extent to which his prophecy was supported by facts. Neither the census of 1801 nor the census of 1811 included a religious census. In 1811, the Dissenters estimated themselves at only 2,000,000 out of a population of 10,000,000.[4] But according to an official inquiry of the same year in parishes of over 1,000 inhabitants the number of Nonconformist chapels considerably exceeded the number of Anglican churches,

[1] *Minutes*, vol. i. p. 270. Cf. *Strictures on Methodism by a careful Observer*, 1804, p. 115: "Their loyal principles, which make an essential part of their religious dogmas, render them loving and obedient subjects. . . . To the passive obedience of the Quakers in principle and in practice, the Methodists as a body join active obedience, without the smallest scruple or reluctance. Hence several of them are found in the Army and Navy; and not a few filling civil offices under Government." This spirit of loyalty inspired the other Methodist sects. See in John Petty's *History of the Primitive Methodist Connexion*, new ed., 1864, p. 21, the account of a camp meeting held in 1807: "Many preachers were now upon the ground. . . . One . . . who had been in the field of war . . . showed the happiness of this land, and the gratitude we owed to God for being far from the seat of war. Another, who had seen the horrors of rebellion lately in Ireland, persuaded us to turn to righteousness, because we were exempt from such calamities."

[2] Wellington to Lieutenant-General Calvert, February 6, 1811 (*Dispatches*, vol. vii. p. 239); Wellington to Lord Eldon, November 13, 1820 (Twiss, *Life of Lord Eldon*, vol. ii. pp. 408–9).

[3] H. of L., June 18, 1810 (*Parl. Deb.*, vol. xvii. p. 762). Cf. *Zeal without Innovation*, 1808, pp. 16–17.

[4] "At least two millions. . . ." Resolutions adopted at a meeting of Nonconformists, May 15, 1811 (*Political Register*, May 22, 1811, vol. xix. p. 1264). In 1797 Robinson, a Baptist, estimated the three old denominations alone as a fifth of the nation (*A Plan of Lectures*, p. 48).

being 3,438 as against 2,533.[1] On the evidence we may conclude that while the nominal members of the Establishment still constituted an enormous majority, the Nonconformists already equalled, if they did not exceed, the Anglicans who practised their religion.

Naturally the ruling classes witnessed this flowing tide with dismay.[2] The squires had no love for the half-starved and shabbily-dressed preachers, and the parsons were annoyed to witness the peace of their parishes disturbed by their fanaticism. On the other hand, the Liberals and Democrats attacked the new type of Dissent with a violence at least equal to theirs. They were exasperated by the unexpected revival of unreasoning illuminism. Among these were Sydney Smith, the eccentric clergyman of the *Edinburgh Review*,[3] and Cobbett in his *Register*,[4] while Leigh Hunt in the *Examiner* surpassed the others in his angry attacks upon the popular evangelicalism.[5] But the leaders of the Whig party were obliged to show a greater circumspection; for they needed Nonconformist support to obtain a majority in the boroughs. The Tories, on the other hand, and their attitude was altogether new, began to consider the susceptibilities of evangelical Nonconformity; for they had remarked that, since the rise of Methodism, Dissent was not so strictly bound as of old to the Whigs. The Whigs were now the party of Catholic Emancipation, and at the general election of 1807 the Court party made a not unsuccessful appeal to the No-Popery prejudices of Dissent. Hence a series of measures administrative and judicial

[1] *Abstract of the Total Number of Parishes in each Diocese of England and Wales, containing a Population of* 1,000 *Persons and upwards; the Number of Churches and Chapels therein, and the Number of Dissenting Places of Worship therein*, May 20, 1812.

[2] See *Creevy Papers*, November 12, 1809: "Warren the lawyer dines with us. . . . He predicts the present reign will end quietly from the popularity of the King, but that when it ends the profligacy and unpopularity of all the Princes, with the situation of the country as to financial difficulties, and the rapidly and widely extended growth of Methodism, will produce a storm" (vol. i. p. 113).

[3] *Edinburgh Review*, January 1806, No. 22, Art. 5, *Ingram on Methodism* (vol. vi. pp. 341 sqq.); April 1809, No. 27, Art. 3, *Styles on Methodists and Missions* (vol. xiv. pp. 10 sqq.).

[4] See especially *Political Register*, May 22, 1811, May 29, 1811, and a little later *Rural Rides*, November 14, 1821.

[5] See especially *An Attempt to show the Folly and Danger of Methodism* . . ., by the editor of the *Examiner* (Leigh Hunt), 1809. See also two articles in the *Examiner*, October 22, November 5, 1815.

carried during the first decade of the century witnessed the greater tolerance now felt in Government circles towards the Nonconformists.

In 1802 the Duke of York, in his capacity as Commander-in-Chief, issued strict orders establishing absolute freedom of worship in the Army.[1] In 1809, the Dissenters obtained from the Government their veto on a law, passed in Jamaica, reserving to Anglican clergy the right to evangelize the slaves.[2] And in the same year a judicial decision granted them the right of burial in the churchyards, and equal freedom with Anglicans from the obligation to pay toll on their way to Sunday worship.[3] It was to satisfy Nonconformist complaints that in 1812, the inferior church courts were deprived of the power of excommunication.[4] And it was also in this year that after long months of struggle the Nonconformists won their most brilliant victory.

Throughout the 18th century it had been recognized that whoever possessed a preacher's license was exempt from the obligation of service in the militia; and so long as Dissent retained its traditional organization the exemption gave rise to no difficulties. But the new system of itinerant and local preachers, inaugurated by Methodism and imitated by the other sects, made it possible for any labourer or farm-hand to escape military service by declaring his intention to preach without offering the least guarantee of education or even of good character. This was an obvious abuse, and in 1800 when political associations and trade unions had been made illegal, the Government had intended to take action. Since the Government was not in a position to make unnecessary enemies, nothing was done in the matter, and the question continued for the present undecided. But the Nonconformists felt their position threatened. In 1803 the Wesleyans organized a Committee of Privileges, modelled on the old Committee of the Three Denominations, to defend their interests in

[1] Bogue and Bennett, *History of the Dissenters*, vol. iv. p. 206.
[2] *Evangelical Magazine*, vol. xvii (1809), pp. 37, 262, 296; Ivimey, *History of the English Baptists*, vol. iv. pp. 85–7.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 565.
[4] 53 Geo. III., cap. 127. See H. of C., January 23, 1812, Sir William Scott's speech in defence of the existing legislation. "It appeared to him upon the whole that no case had been made out to call for so serious an inquiry; and he rather feared that the facility of the noble Lord had been imposed upon by malignant representations from other quarters" (*Parl. Deb.*, vol. xxi. p. 309). Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 316–17, for an instance of persecution mentioned by William Smith.

Parliament and in the courts.[1] At the same time Conference endeavoured to forestall State interference by regulating the legal status of its preachers. Members of local congregations were forbidden, under penalty of expulsion, to seek a license from the civil authorities without the previous approbation of the Conference of their circuit.[2] The decision was not calculated to satisfy the Government. It was precisely these missionaries, delegated by a distant authority and unattached to any particular congregation, whose activities alarmed the Anglican clergy. Nor, apparently, was it seriously carried out, since the Conference of 1810 judged it necessary to insist on obedience.[3] In 1811 the Cabinet returned to the design abandoned in 1800. Lord Sidmouth introduced in the House of Lords a Bill imposing a number of restrictions on the exemption from service hitherto granted to all Nonconformist preachers.[4] Immediately the entire Nonconformist body was in arms. For the first time an alliance was concluded between the old and the new Dissent. The Wesleyan Committee of Privileges joined the Committee of the Three Denominations; and the Wesleyans, owing to their more perfect organization, directed the agitation. They launched a manifesto in which they called attention to the beneficent influence exercised by the Nonconformist sects during the previous half-century, "in raising the standard of public morals, and in promoting loyalty in the middle ranks, as well as subordination and industry in the lower orders of society." The war with France rendered national unanimity particularly urgent. Why then revive old hostilities?[5] Two influential Nonconformists who played an active part in Parliament, William Smith and Thomas Thompson, approached Lord Sidmouth. The Cabinet let the Bill drop before the Second Reading.

Nevertheless Anglican die-hards still possessed a weapon

[1] *Life of Wilberforce*, vol. ii. pp. 355–6, 360 sqq. For these first attempts see *Zeal without Bigotry*, 1809, p. 44. R. A. Ingram, *Causes of Increase of Methodism*, 1807, pp. 144–6. At the end o his pamphlet he urged legal regulation of the status of the Nonconformist "teachers."

[2] *Minutes*, vol. iii. p. 93.

[3] *Ibid.*, vol. iii. p. 93.

[4] For the history of the Bill see the abundant details given in Pellew's *Life of Lord Sidmouth*, vol. iii. pp. 38 sqq. Cf. *Life of Wilberforce*, vol. ii. pp. 507 sqq. The complete text of the Bill will be found printed after the proceedings in the House of Lords, May 9, 1811 (*Parl. Deb.*, vol. xix. pp. 1128 sqq.).

[5] For the text of the resolutions adopted on May 14, 1811, see *Methodist Magazine*, vol. xxxiv. pp. 558–60.

against their enemies. What they could not obtain by legislation, they could obtain indirectly in the courts. A Nonconformist preacher, who had failed to take the oath required by the Toleration Act, remained subject to the penal legislation of the Five Mile Act, and the Conventicle Act. But the Toleration Act had not foreseen the new forms of organization which the Methodists had introduced into Nonconformity, especially the system of itinerant preachers. The local justices began to take advantage of this to refuse the oaths of all preachers who could not prove their attachment to a particular congregation.[1] And the decisions of the magistrates were confirmed on appeal by the Court of King's Bench.[2] For the second time the world of Nonconformity was in an uproar. A new association was formed for the defence of Protestant liberty.[3] The Wesleyan Committee of Privileges called upon the ministers and preachers of the denomination to "suffer distress on their goods, or imprisonment of their persons, rather than pay any penalties for worshipping God agreeably to the dictates of their consciences."[4] It would have been madness on the part of the Cabinet to antagonize the Nonconformists at a moment when the supporters of Catholic Emancipation were stronger than they had ever been.[5] In 1811 Perceval had abandoned the attempt to alter the existing legislation to the prejudice of the Nonconformists. In 1812 he altered it in their favour. The Bill he had drawn up was passed after his death, in July.[6] This Act,[7] popularly known as the New Toleration Act, repealed the Five Mile Act and the Conventicle Act, and only renewed their pro-

[1] *Evangelical Magazine*, vol. xx. January 1812, p. 37; March 1812, p. 114.

[2] *Ibid.*, vol. xx. p. 116.

[3] Protestant Society for the Protection of Religious Liberty. See Skeat, *History of the Free Churches*, p. 558. It was this society which selected in 1812 three cases given against the preachers by the justices of the peace for decision on appeal by the King's Bench (*Evangelical Magazine*, vol. xx. p. 116).

[4] See the complete text of the circular in Richard Treffry, *Life of the Rev. Joseph Benson*, pp. 287–8, February 24, 1812.

[5] See Lord Liverpool's letter to Lord Sidmouth, May 20, 1811 (Pellew, *Life of Lord Sidmouth*, vol. iii. p. 62), and from Lord Eldon to Dr. Swire, September 22, 1812 (Twiss, *Life of Lord Eldon*, vol. ii. p. 225). For the advantage taken by the Opposition of this tactical blunder of their opponents, see Lord Holland, *Further Memoirs of the Whig Party*, pp. 101–2.

[6] H. of C., July 10, 20, 1812; H. of L., July 23, 24, 25, 1812 (*Parl. Deb.*, vol. xxiii. pp. 994, 1105, 1191, 1247, 1250).

[7] 50 Geo. III, cap. 155.

visions with most important modifications. Henceforward, religious meetings of under twenty persons were exempt from all control, as previously meetings of under five persons. This facilitated the prayer meetings of laymen held in private houses which the Methodist revival had brought into fashion. All exemptions which the law bestowed on clergymen, including exemption from military service, were expressly granted to the itinerant preachers.[1] An amendment introduced later in the House of Lords provided that the preacher must be a professional preacher and must not work at any other trade for his livelihood.[2] Thus the benefit of the Act, granted to the itinerant preachers, was refused to the local preachers. But this does not affect the fact that the new organization of the Nonconformist sects had received legal recognition by an Act passed unanimously and after the most cursory debates. And the victory won by the Evangelical Dissenters redounded to the advantage of their rationalist brethren.[3] In 1813 the Unitarians were able to advance from the practical toleration which they had hitherto enjoyed to legal recognition.[4]

THE INFLUENCE OF METHODISM ON THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. THE EVANGELICAL MOVEMENT

The Rise and the Present Position of the Evangelical Party in the Church.

Throughout the debates in Parliament during 1811 and 1812, on the degree of toleration to be granted to the sects, the Anglican prelates had either kept silence or adopted a conciliatory attitude. Not that there was much love lost between Anglicans and Nonconformists. No doubt the majority of the magistrates, who in 1812 refused licenses to the itinerant preachers, were parsons. But at the very time when Nonconformity was being remodelled, and by

[1] Every person, it is stated in clause ix, who shall teach or preach in any such Congregation or Assembly, or *Congregations or Assemblies*. The plural met the case of the itinerant preachers.

[2] Accepted July 24th, in consequence of representations made by Lord Sidmouth on July 23rd (*Parl. Deb.*, vol. xxiii. pp. 1192–3, 1247).

[3] For the skirmishes that took place between the rationalist and evangelical advocates of religious toleration, see H. of L., July 3, 1812, Lord Stanhope's speech (*Parl. Deb.*, vol. xxiii. pp. 887 sqq.).

[4] 53 Geo. III, cap. 160.

its growing alienation from democracy was winning Tory favour, the Church of England was the victim of a species of internal schism which enfeebled her power of resistance. In 1815 the *Quarterly Review* deplored the unhappy condition of the Church rent by the mutual antagonism of two powerful parties, "the breach daily widening, animosities daily inflamed, and charity almost extinguished by controversial rancour."[1] Here also Methodist influence was at work.

To be sure John Wesley had been driven from the church of which he was an ordained priest. But he had left a rearguard behind him which persisted in the attempt to realize his original dream, not the creation of a new sect, but the regeneration of the Church herself. Several clergymen, disciples of Wesley and Whitefield, without breaking with the Church, had founded in their parishes, on their individual initiative, little groups of laymen who met for mutual edification and the propagation of religious truth.[2] And laymen built chapels to supply the lack of churches, which they maintained at their own cost and under their private control, without consulting either the clergyman of the parish or the bishop of the diocese. Under their direction the old Low Church party was reorganized, no longer as of old liberal and rationalist, but pietist, or, as it was termed, evangelical. And this fact obliges us to complicate with an additional feature our picture of organized religion in England. If the Wesleyan sect, with its hierarchic constitution, and frank political conservatism, constituted the High Church of Nonconformity, the new Low Church or evangelical party was a species of Anglican Methodism. What had been the history of the movement? It originated with a number of clergymen who, if they did not break with the Church of which they were the accredited officers, did not

[1] *Quarterly Review*, October 1815, Art. 12, *Lives of Melanchthon and Jeremy Taylor* (vol. xiv. p. 237). Cf. *Life of Hannah More*, vol. iii. p. 445, letter to Mr. Harford, February 22, 1816: "Our church . . . is rent in pieces by the divisions of the High Church and the evangelical parties. O how I hate faction, divisions and controversy in religion!"

[2] The indeterminate character of these groups was clearly marked in the debates of 1812 on the New Toleration Act. The Evangelicals took care that the word Nonconformist should not be used in the clause defining the legal status of preachers. Their object was to prevent the lay directors of their societies from being faced with the alternative of dissolving the societies or going over to Dissent. See *Life of Wilberforce*, vol. iii. pp. 507–8, 509; also *Correspondence between Jebb and Knox*, vol. ii. pp. 221–2 (*Letter from Jebb to Knox*, May 25, 1815).

display a scrupulous regard for her discipline. They continued to befriend Wesley and Whitefield, gave them hospitality when their preaching tours brought them to their parishes, even invited them to occupy their pulpits, and sometimes imitated their example by evangelizing neighbouring parishes, whose clergymen gave scandal by their lukewarmness. Among them were Walker, the Cornish revivalist; Hervey, the author of *Meditations in a Churchyard*; Grimshaw, the "mad parson" of the Yorkshire moors, who whipped his flock to church; John Newton, who after a youth spent in the slave trade became parson of Olney, and boasted the "conversion" of the poet Cowper; and others of a sterner and colder disposition, such as Venn and Romaine. All this generation had now passed away, and it was at the very moment of its gradual extinction, during the last years of the 18th century and the opening years of the 19th, that the Evangelicals organized themselves as a party with centres of propaganda, and methods peculiar to themselves, a party with no lack of friends proud to avow their friendship, yet attracting the implacable hostility of others.

The first centre of the Evangelical movement was the University of Cambridge, where the party possessed two great men, the leaders of Evangelicalism among the clergy. These were Isaac Milner and Charles Simeon. Isaac Milner, a man of awe-inspiring and overwhelming personality—one of his admirers compared him to a sledge hammer—occupied the chair of Newton. At once president of Queen's College and Dean of Carlisle,[1] he was rather the professor than the scientist, and the preacher far more than the professor. Charles Simeon was vicar of Christ Church for thirty-two years. He received no stipend, performing his clerical functions purely for the love of God, and had even abandoned his share of his father's estate to his brother, lest excessive wealth should seduce him from his duty. Nevertheless he was still a rich man and lived as a gentleman.[2] For years he had to face the opposition of the fellows of his college, indeed of all the members of the university, graduates and undergraduates alike. The farmers of the neighbourhood and the poor of the town attended his sermons, which were interrupted by the jeers and booing of the undergraduates. But he possessed that distinctive form of genius, blent of

[1] Carus, *Life of Simeon*, p. 373, Simeon to the Rev. Thomas Thomason, August 16, 1813.

[2] See the description of his style of living in Arthur Young's *Autobiography*, p. 399.

meekness and severity, which goes to make the great churchman. And this carried him through to final triumph, and enabled him, despite the persistent hatred of which he was the object, to become one of the most respected men in Cambridge. He was ready, when the occasion required, to endure the worst insults. But he could also crush his opponents with a look,[1] invoke the aid of the police, and punish those who insulted him with public humiliations, even with imprisonment. Under his orders was ranged a little army of 120 enthusiasts, organized on the Wesleyan model in groups of twenty, who met regularly for meditation in common, public confession, and the management of a charitable fund. In the neighbourhood, he had his "circuit" of parishes which he visited periodically. At Cambridge, Simeon recruited a body of young Evangelical clergy, whom he scattered later throughout the kingdom to leaven insensibly Anglican preaching with the spirit of the new pietism.[2]

The Cambridge group were supported by another group at Clapham near London. This was a group of laymen who linked the Evangelical clergy with the world of politics and business to which they themselves belonged. Its members were men of wealth, who provided funds for the construction of chapels, and the purchase of advowsons.[3] In this way they enabled the clergymen trained by Simeon to employ freely under their patronage the new methods of evangelization, secure from episcopal interference. Their leader was Wilberforce, distinguished as a parliamentarian, famous as a philanthropist.

From 1795 to 1808 he lived at Clapham, on Battersea Rise. His neighbours were the Thorntons, bankers and philanthropists; Zachary Macaulay, the editor of the *Christian Observer*; Lord Teignmouth, formerly Governor-General of India; James Stephen, the lawyer. This group of pietists had chosen as their parish clergyman John Venn, son of the celebrated Henry Venn. To their receptions at Clapham there gathered a motley throng of Anglican clergymen, Nonconformist ministers, gentlemen of means,

[1] "Two young men . . . came into my church in a most disorderly way; and as usual I fixed my eye upon them with sternness, indicative of my displeasure. One of them was abashed; but the other, *the only one that ever was daring enough to withstand my eye . . .*" (Carus, *Life of Simeon*, p. 92).

[2] Carus, *Life of Simeon*, chap. vii. pp. 137 sqq.

[3] For the rumours current about this see *Zeal without Innovation*, pp. 149–50.

lawyers, business men, and representatives of all the oppressed races on earth—Spaniards and Portuguese from Europe and America, Negroes, Hindus. It required all Wilberforce's tact and affability to secure harmony even for a single evening among guests so ill-assorted as these.

The Clapham group, it was called the Clapham sect, consisted chiefly of Members of Parliament. There they were joined by other members; country gentlemen such as Sir Richard Hill had been formerly, and Thomas Babington was at present, Nonconformists of the mercantile class like Thomas Thompson, the Methodist banker of Hull, William Smith and Joseph Butterworth. Together they formed a little party of their own filled with self-importance, "the party of the Saints," to use the mocking epithet of their opponents. Though William Smith belonged to the Opposition, the Saints were generally speaking Conservatives, and voted for Pitt and his successors. But they stood for independence and morality. In 1795 Wilberforce had braved Pitt's anger and jeopardized his own popularity by speaking in favour of peace. In 1805 he had voted for the trial of Lord Melville, and in 1809 for an inquiry into the Duke of York scandal. In a political crisis the independence of Wilberforce and his friends might threaten the existence of the Cabinet. From the depths of Gloucestershire the famous Hannah More, novelist, theologian, reformer of morals, evangelist of the poor, founder of schools, and a woman who treated on an equal footing with bishops, collaborated with the Saints by her writings and philanthropic activities. No picture of the evangelical group would be complete which left unmentioned so notable a celebrity. Equally with Wilberforce and Simeon, she was one of the "great men" of the party.

A religious party must possess a common belief. The Evangelicals plainly belonged to the Calvinist tradition. But their Calvinism was of a very mild variety. When at the close of the 18th century an exceedingly long and exceedingly violent theological controversy had arisen between the Arminians of the school of Wesley and the Calvinists who followed Whitefield,[1] the "Saints" had carefully avoided taking part in it. If they did not accept Wesley's Arminianism it was because they rejected certain of his private opinions, the doctrine of instantaneous conversion, that God in an instant by a sudden miracle transfers sinners to a state of grace, and the doctrine of perfection, that a sinner once

[1] Hunt, *Religious Thought*, vol. iii. pp. 297 sqq.; Overton, *Evangelical Movement*, pp. 120 sqq.

saved can never relapse. But on the other hand, they were repelled by the extravagance of orthodox Calvinism. They rejected the paradox, too subtle and too immoral for their liking, that all works are essentially worthless. "How I hate," wrote Hannah More in 1802, "the little narrowing names of Arminian and Calvinist. . . . *Bible* Christianity is what I love; that does not insist on opinions indifferent in themselves."[1] "I began," wrote Isaac Milner, "to study the controversy when a very strong Arminian. *Very close thought shook my Arminianism.* . . . But I think I have learned where to stop. Calvin is much too systematical for me."[2] "Though a moderate Calvinist myself, I think," wrote Simeon, "the great mass of Calvinists are wrong."[3] Wilberforce could even write in 1822 that every year he became "more impressed with the unscriptural character of the Calvinistic system."[4] Nothing places in a clearer light the decay of the old dogmatic Calvinism than the aversion to it displayed towards the close of the 18th century by the leaders of the last great Protestant revival, by the Arminian Wesley and by the moderate Calvinists of the Evangelical party. The Evangelicals accepted as a general principle the dogma of justification by faith, but they declined to speculate on the niceties of the doctrine. They were not theologians but men of emotion and action. Their Calvinism. if we are entitled to use the term to describe their position, was a sentimental and a practical Calvinism—one might almost say, an undoctrinal Calvinism.

This feature of Evangelicalism made it easy for its adherents to work with Protestants of every denomination. For while the Evangelicals maintained the theological principle which was the common foundation of all the doctrinal systems of Protestantism, they systematically refused to interest themselves in the theological differences which held Protestants apart. And their philanthropic activity constituted a bond with the Nonconformists, their fellow philanthropists. Here also was common ground on which they continually met. "These city people are better than at our end of the town,"[5] wrote Wilberforce at the

[1] W. Roberts, *Memoirs of the Life and Correspondence of Mrs. Hannah Moore*, vol. iii. p. 196 (extract from her diary, July 8, 1802).

[2] Mary Milner, *Life of Isaac Milner*, p. 660.

[3] Carus, *Life of Simeon*, p. 418, Simeon to the Rev. W. Carus Wilson, October 11, 1815.

[4] *Life of Wilberforce*, vol. v. p. 162.

[5] April 1790 (*Life*, vol. i. p. 265).

outset of his career as a religious reformer after dining with some of his new friends. Sprung himself from the gentry, he found himself introduced into the world of commerce. There he met indeed a majority of Anglicans but Dissenters also, and he did not fail to appreciate the earnestness and zeal of the later.

Some of these were Methodists, but their number was few; for Methodism, a new sect, drew its adherents chiefly from the lower and lower middle classes. Others were members of a sect of which no mention has hitherto been made, so eccentric is its character, and so difficult is it to classify or describe, the "Friends" or "Quakers." The sect was revolutionary in its obstinate refusal to take oaths in the courts, to pay tithes, and to perform military service, but of all revolutionary groups it was the most peaceable. For Quakers condemned rebellion equally with war and for the same reason, and offered the Government only a passive resistance. They deliberately rejected all forms of worship, or courtesy. But this contempt for forms had itself degenerated into a rigid formalism. Public opinion, if it laughed at the comic aspects of Quakerism, respected the solemn silence of their meetings, which contrasted strikingly with the noisy and emotional services of the new sects, their honesty, their spirit of order and economy, their unwearied and enlightened charity. Wilberforce's friends worked side by side with rich Quakers, and respected business men of the three old denominations—Independents, Baptists, and Presbyterians. Among the latter, however, were Socinians and Rationalists. But even with these the Evangelicals were willing to enter into friendly relations. They were indeed on good terms with avowed Liberals, attached to no denomination, and with Free Thinkers who made no secret of their hostility to religion. It was enough, if their friends were animated by a sincere and practical zeal for the reformation of abuses, and the crusade against ignorance and vice. By a strange paradox men who were Protestant to the backbone, zealots for the dogma of justification by faith, were so devoted to philanthropy that on the common ground of good works they were reconciled with the most lukewarm Christians, even with declared enemies of Christianity.

But as the Evangelicals thus entered into frequent relations with heretics of every kind they condemned themselves to increasing isolation and suspicion within the Anglican communion. The existence of numerous and powerful Protestant sects has always been a source of weakness to the party within the Church of England which emphasizes most strongly her Protestant character. With few exceptions the

Episcopal Bench adopted an attitude of frank hostility. Bishop Porteus of London, indeed, inclined to Evangelical views. But he had died in 1810, and in 1811 his successor had issued a charge fulminating in the most violent language against traitors more dangerous to the Church than avowed Nonconformists.[1] Bishop Yorke, of Ely, had protected Simeon against the local persecution to which he had been exposed. But he died in 1811 and his successor, Dampier, employed every means in his power to annoy Simeon and check his irregular propaganda.[2] Who were the Bishops on whom the Evangelicals could now count for protection? Shute Barrington of Durham and Henry Bathurst of Norwich. These prelates, however, tolerated the Evangelicals rather from a broad-minded and liberal temper than from any sympathy with their views. And there was also Bishop Burgess of St. David's, who was active in the moral reform of his clergy, an ardent supporter of the propaganda for the abolition of slavery, and a friend of Hannah More. In 1815 they won an important victory. Dr. Ryder, the brother of an influential minister, was appointed to the see of Gloucester. "This is a wonderful event," exclaimed Simeon. "He is truly, and in every respect, a man of God. . . . He preached for me at Trinity, not two years ago, and I for him at Lutterworth, not half a year ago. Does it not appear that God is with us of a truth?"[3] But Simeon's very delight proves that the gain of a seat on the Episcopal Bench was a rare, almost a miraculous, success for the Evangelicals.

The party was a minority not only of the Episcopate but of the Church as a whole. It consoled itself for this by regarding itself as the salt of the Church. What was the number of true Christians? Simeon was asked the question by the agriculturist Arthur Young, himself a convinced pietist.[4] The Quaker Fry estimated their numbers at 3,000,000; but Simeon considered his estimate too optimistic. At Cambridge he knew only 110 "vital Christians," that is only 1 per cent. of the inhabitants. The Evangelicals managed to persuade first themselves, then by degrees the general public, that they were the only true Christians. Did Coleridge repudiate his youthful pantheism and return to orthodox Christianity? At once the rumour spread that he had

[1] See a criticism of the charge illustrated by quotations in the *British Review*, 1811 (vol. i. pp. 418 sqq.).

[2] Carus, *Life of Simeon*, pp. 234, 276, 326 sqq.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 406, Simeon to the Rev. T. Thomason, May 19, 1815. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 372.

[4] Arthur Young, *Autobiography*, p. 398.

turned Methodist.[1] Did Lord Eldon allow himself to write a long private letter filled with pious reflections? He judged it prudent to explain to his correspondent at the close that his piety must not be taken as proof that he had joined the Saints.[2] Never in the history of Anglicanism had any party exercised so profound an influence. Never had any party been in such a false position.

The Reform of Ecclesiastical Abuses.

Did the abuses which disgraced the Establishment cry for reformation? The Saints were ready to undertake the task. To adopt the language of one of their pamphleteers,[3] they sought to expel from the parsonage Parson Dolittle and Parson Merryman and to replace them by Parson Lovegood.[3] They desired numerous churches, resident parsons, well-paid curates. Already in 1783 Wilberforce expressed his belief that his friendship with Pitt had placed him in a position to effect much in the way of reform. Reforming statutes he thought would be his for the asking, even the appointment of a bishop chosen by himself.[4] But we have already remarked the poor success of his efforts to secure bishoprics. And his attempts at legislation were thwarted by Episcopal opposition. He failed to carry a Bill to facilitate the construction of churches by private persons through granting the advowsons to those who had borne the expense of their erection.[5] The Bishops were far too ill-disposed towards these proprietary chapels which escaped their control, were strongholds of the semi-heretical Evangelicals, and were even on occasion shared with Nonconformists.[6] Wilberforce and his friends were more successful

[1] *Journal of Lady Holland*, vol. ii. p. 238 (1808): "His nature is radically bad, he hates and envies all that are good and celebrated and to gratify that spleen he has given into Methodism. . . ."

[2] Twiss, *Life of Lord Eldon*, vol. ii. p. 64, April 7, 1808: "Though I write in this style and have been very unwell and still am not as I should be, and however grave you may think me, don't think me a 'saint'; I mean a 'modern saint.' The more I see of that character, the less I like it."

[3] *Village Dialogues between Farmer Littleworth and Thomas Newman, Rev. Messrs. Lovegood, Dolittle, and Others*, by Rowland Hill, 2nd ed., 1801.

[4] *Life of Wilberforce*, vol. ii. p. 200.

[5] *Ibid.*, vol. ii. p. 362, Wilberforce to William Hey, September 9, 1800.

[6] Danteny's *Guide to the Church*, quoted by Overton, *English Church in the 19th Century*, p. 148.

in their attempts to deal with the non-residence of vicars and the pauperism of curates, but only after long struggles marked by countless vicissitudes. Their history is not without interest, for it casts a brilliant light on the attitude and power of each of the rival parties then contesting the government of the Anglican Church.

In 1796 Parliament passed an Act enabling bishops to raise the stipends of the curates in their diocese to £75 instead of the previous maximum of £50.[1] The cost of living had risen and curates had an equal right to consideration with other minor officials. Their stipend was deducted from the stipend of their vicars, who were thus submitted to an indirect and inadequate penalty for non-residence. Wilberforce desired a more radical measure, but had failed to secure a hearing.[2] And, moreover, we must take into consideration the character of the Act as a whole. Bishops were given power to fix the stipends of curates at their uncontrolled discretion, and power also, for any cause they deemed good and reasonable, to revoke curates' licenses summarily and without process of law. The curates' sole appeal was to the Archbishop, who was to decide by a summary procedure. Thus the object of the Act was apparently to strengthen the position of the Episcopate. It offered greater satisfaction to the High Church than to the Low Church party.

Five years passed by. The vicars' non-residence began to be felt as a scandal. There existed an Act of Henry VIII never since repealed,[3] prohibiting, under severe penalties pluralism, non-residence and clerical trading or farming. Moreover, this old Act gave private persons the right to prosecute for its infringement and even promised them a reward, if successful in proving their charge. Two or three lawyers realized that there was money to be made out of the Act and began the prosecution on a large scale of churchmen who had violated its provisions. The High Church took alarm. They procured first the passage of a Bill suspending for a year all prosecutions for breaches of Henry's Act.[4] Then Sir William Scott, brother of the Lord Chancellor and an orthodox High Churchman, carried a

[1] 36 Geo. III, cap. 83.

[2] *Life of Wilberforce*, vol. ii. pp. 146–7. The debates have left no record in the *Parliamentary History*. H. of C., May 5, 1796 (*Parliamentary Register*, vol. xliv. pp. 598–9).

[3] 21 Henry VIII, cap. 13.

[4] H. of C., June 9, 19, 1801 (*Parliamentary History*, vol. xxxv. pp. 1549 sqq.).

Bill which mitigated very considerably legislation so galling to the clergy.[1]

Henceforward, it was legal for a clergyman to manage a farm, if he had obtained his bishop's consent. The right of non-residence, that is, of absence for a period exceeding three months, was granted *ipso facto* to clergymen who held certain specified diocesan offices, and bishops were given the power to grant permission for non-residence in a number of cases, which the Act enumerated in detail and which included the simultaneous possession of several benefices, and they were even permitted to go further and grant this licence outside the cases specified by the Act. On this occasion the Evangelicals were apparently divided. Grant spoke in favour of the Act. Simeon's brother criticized it in a speech approved by Wilberforce. He denounced "a new order of ecclesiastical law" which "went to place an unconstitutional power in the hands of the bishops."[2]

On the whole the Act of 1803 plainly constituted a victory for the High Church. Sir William Scott completed the Act of 1803 by two further Bills. The object of one of these was to indemnify curates who might find themselves suddenly deprived of their curacies because the bishop had enforced residence on their vicars.[3] It was passed this same year.[4] The object of the other was to complete the Act of 1796 and to encourage the residence of curates by improving their financial position. But the Bill, though introduced four times in succession in both Houses,[5] was finally rejected. The Bill provided that when the annual value of a benefice exceeded £400 the bishop could assign a fifth part of the income to the curate, if that fifth did not exceed £200 or £250 a year. The opponents of the Bill stigmatized it as an

[1] 43 Geo. III, cap. 84. H. of C., April 7, May 21, 1802; April 6, May 26, June 10, 1803. H. of L., June 10, 1803 (*Parliamentary History*, vol. xxxvi. pp. 463, 882, 1514, 1579).

[2] H. of C., May 31, 1802. Cf. *Life of Wilberforce*, vol. iii. p. 49.

[3] H. of L., December 12, 1803 (*Parl. Deb.*, vol. i. p. 1760).

[4] 44 Geo. III, cap. 4.

[5] First by Sir William Smith, then by Perceval, then by Porteous. H. of C., December 1 and 2, 1803; H. of L., December 12, 1803; H. of C., April 30, May 6, 21, 30, July 4, 1805; H. of C., April 14, 25, 1806; H. of C., February 9, 10, April 12, 13, May 10, June 8, 14, 1808; H. of L., June 21, 22, 27, 28, 1808 (*Parl. Deb.*, vol. i. pp. 1577, 1578, 1760; vol. iv. pp. 510, 611; vol. v. pp. 41, 152, 737; vol. vi. pp. 741, 922; vol. x. pp. 407, 413; vol. xi. pp. 54, 61, 141, 833, 876, 958, 975, 1086, 1893). Cf. Hodgson, *Life of Porteous*, p. 243.

equalitarian and Jacobin measure. Every rector and vicar, they maintained, had a right to the full income of his benefice, and the State could not transfer a portion of that income to a curate without violating the property of the lay patron and the incumbent. One is accustomed to arguments of this sort from the opponents of reform; but in this instance they were used by Whig speakers.[1]

Behind the Bill they scented the activity of the Evangelicals, and this prejudiced them against it from the outset. For they had no affection for the Low Church party since it had become imbued with this new spirit, a spirit as unlike the spirit of the old Low Church party, which had been consistently Latitudinarian and devoted to the Whigs, as the new Dissent, permeated by Methodism, was unlike the old Rationalist Nonconformity.[2] Nor had they failed to remark the alliance between the Evangelicals and the High Church party to carry the Bill. The "Saints" had desired stricter legislation which would have imposed on vicars an unconditional obligation to set aside a fixed portion of their stipend for their curates. Since that was beyond their reach,[3] they acquiesced in a Bill which abandoned the curate to the discretion of his diocesan. By this concession they purchased the support of the High Church party and the bishops. The Archbishop of Canterbury expressed his satisfaction that the new Bill restored to the bishops a power they had exercised in the primitive Church and had only lost after the Reformation.[4] It is not, therefore, surprising that the Whigs should oppose legislation which revived the traditions of Catholicism, restricted lay patronage in the interest of the hierarchy, struck a blow at Erastianism, and strengthened clericalism in the Church of England. The Bill was rejected. And even the Act of 1803, inadequate and conservative as it was, was never applied. Vicars

[1] Beside the debates in the House, the articles in the *Edinburgh Review* afford samples of the criticisms directed by the Opposition against the new ecclesiastical legislation (see *Edinburgh Review*, April 1803, No. 22, *Sturges on the Residence of the Clergy* (vol. ii. pp. 202 sqq.); January 1805, No. 10, *Observations on Dr. Sturges' Pamphlet respecting the Non-residence of the Clergy* (vol. v. pp. 301 sqq.)

[2] See especially the speeches of Creevy and Windham, H. of C., June 8, 1808 (*Parl. Deb.*, vol. xi. pp. 833–4, 839). Cf. *Life of Wilberforce*, vol. iii. pp. 364 sqq.

[3] See the reservations made by William Smith and Wilberforce in their speeches on behalf of the Bill (H. of C., June 8, 1808). *Ibid.*, pp. 835–6, 837–8.

[4] H. of L., June 27, 1808 (*Parl. Deb.*, vol. xi. p. 1091).

neglected to obtain from their diocesan a renewal of their license for non-residence. The bishops neglected to draw up, as the Act prescribed, an annual list of non-resident clergy. The abuse of non-residence prevailed even more widely than before.

But the influence of the Evangelicals was on the increase. Perceval, who became Prime Minister in 1809, favoured them. Lord Harrowby, a Cabinet Minister, was himself an Evangelical. He it was who in 1815 secured the nomination of his brother, Dr. Ryder, to the see of Gloucester. In 1810 Perceval obtained from Parliament a grant of £100,000 to improve the condition of the poorer clergy. Lord Harrowby supported the grant in the House of Lords, but dwelt on its inadequacy.[1] Legislation, he urged, of a more comprehensive character was necessary to cure the evils under which the Church suffered and to enable her to check the continuous progress of Nonconformity. The clergy must be compelled to keep their parsonages in repair. In too many parishes they were either non-existent or uninhabitable; which provided the clergy with a welcome excuse for non-residence. The law should define the maximum distance between the livings which might be held by one incumbent. And in every instance the bishop should assign the curate a fixed stipend, which in poor livings might absorb the total value of the benefice. And a Government subsidy should secure a minimum stipend, graduated in accordance with the size of the parish, to all clergymen without exception. The Bill introduced by Lord Harrowby in 1812, and through his efforts passed into law the following year, gave a partial effect to these extensive proposals.[2]

Henceforward, in parishes where the population did not exceed 300, a curate possessed the right to a minimum stipend of £80, or to a stipend equal to the value of the living if its annual value did not exceed £80. This minimum stipend was increased, when the population of the parish exceeded 300, and again when it exceeded 500. If the annual value of a benefice exceeded £400, the bishop was given power to assign £100 to the curate, and to make him a further allocation proportionate to the size of the parish. The Saints gave their unreserved support to Lord Harrowby's Bill.[3]

[1] H. of L., June 1810 (*Parl. Deb.*, vol. xvii. pp. 752 sqq.).

[2] 53 Geo. III, cap. 149. H. of L., June 18, 26, 1812; H. of L., March 11, 23, May 17, 21, 1813; H. of C., July 5, 8, 13, 1813 (*Parl. Deb.*, vol. xxiii. pp. 592, 771; vol. xxv. pp. 2, 256; vol. xxvi. pp. 210, 295, 1115, 1171, 1197).

[3] See especially the speeches of Wilberforce, Thomas Thompson, H. Thornton, H. of C., July 8, 1813 (*Parl. Deb.*, vol. xxvi. p. 1171).

But this time the High Church party were hostile.[1] In the House of Lords the bishops were loud in their protests against a Bill which, they declared, destroyed the Anglican hierarchy, arrayed curates against their vicars, and imposed rigid rules on the heads of the Church instead of leaving them, like the earlier Acts, the unfettered exercise of their discretion. On this occasion, there is no doubt, the advantage rested with the Evangelicals.

Then the High Church party took the offensive. The Act of 1803 had not been regularly applied, and it contained clauses maintaining the old right of private prosecution. The clergy, once more exposed to the unwelcome attentions of the informer, were loud in their demands for relief. Parliament acted, as it had acted thirteen years earlier. To put a stop to the prosecution of vicars[2] the operation of the Act of 1803 was suspended for a year, and the suspension annually renewed till 1817, when the Archbishop of Canterbury introduced and carried an Act of general scope consolidating previous measures, a miniature code of canon law.[3] The Acts of 1803 and 1813 were refurbished and combined in one Act. Curates were given the right of farming even without the bishop's consent, provided the farm did not exceed eighty acres. Otherwise episcopal authority

---

Cf. *Parl. Deb.*, vol. xxvi. p. 299: "The Earl of Radnor said, that one object of the Bill had been stated to be the discouragement of sectaries. He did not think it had that tendency; and it would be found, on the division, that the friends of sectaries would vote for it."

[1] For the High Church opposition see a letter from Copleston to his father, January 29, 1814 (*Memoir of Copleston*, p. 47): "The leading partisans who assume that title (of High Churchmen) appear to me only occupied with the thought of converting the property of the Church to their private advantage, leaving the duties to be performed how they can." Copleston contributed to the *Quarterly Review* for October 1813 an article in support of the new Act (Art. 3, *The Earl of Harrowby's Speech on the Curacy Bill*, vol. x. pp. 49 sqq.). Cf. *Letters of the Earl of Dudley to the Bishop of Llandaff*, p. 6, letter written January 28, 1814.

[2] H. of C., November 17, 20, 24, 1813; March 24, 28, 30, 31, April 4, 26, 1814 (*Parl. Deb.*, vol. xxvii. pp. 128, 168, 193, 355, 371, 385, 395, 409, 551).

[3] 57 Geo. III. cap. 99. It was again Sir William Scott who had taken the initiative three years earlier (H. of C. May 9, 1814, *Parl. Deb.*, vol. xxvii. p. 741). See H. of L., June 12, 1816; H. of C., May 16, 1817 (*Parl. Deb.*, vol. xxxiv. p. 1084, vol. xxxvi. p. 683).

was strengthened. Private persons lost the right of prosecution. On the whole the Act of 1817 was a High Church victory. But its complicated provisions bore the marks of the long conflict between the rival parties, their diverse demands, their respective defeats.

Foreign Missions and Bible Societies.

When from the reform of the internal organization of the Church, we turn to the encouragement of her foreign missions, we find the Evangelicals faced by the same prejudices. In 1776 they had founded the Society for Missions in Africa and the East. Simeon advised the foundation, John Venn, the parson of Clapham, took the chair at the first meetings, Henry Thornton was the first treasurer. The society was strictly Anglican, and to makes its Anglicanism plain the founders in 1812 changed its name to the Church Missionary Society. But from what quarter was its inspiration derived? Plainly from Methodism and the new Dissent. When the 18th century opened and for many years to come there was not a single Protestant missionary in the entire world with the exception of the small German group of the Moravian Brethren. Under the direct influence of the Moravians Wesley had revived the missionary spirit among the Protestants of England. The Methodists were the first to organize, in 1787, a regular system of foreign missions. Wilberforce and Henry Thornton were among the subscribers. In 1792 the Baptists followed their example. In 1795 the Evangelicals founded, before their Anglican society, a London Missionary Society, based on the principle of united action by all denominations of orthodox Christians. Since Nonconformist missionaries were now scattered throughout the British colonies, wherever there were aborigines or slaves to be converted, in Nova Scotia, Jamaica, Trinidad, on the West Coast of Africa, among the Hottentots, in the East Indies, it was natural that the High Church party should regard with suspicion the Evangelical Society for Missions. Could such a society be trusted to combat heartily the Nonconformist missionaries? On the contrary, was not the Society openly encouraging these missionaries, even making them frequent grants and seeking only to supplement their work by action on similar lines? Two incidents, still recent in 1815, had revealed the depth of the gulf which on these matters divided the Evangelicals from the Anglican hierarchy.

The first of these incidents had arisen from the action of

the Bible Society,[1] another missionary society founded by the Evangelicals in 1804. There was already in existence a society dating from the close of the 17th century, the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, composed exclusively of Anglicans, of which the archbishops and bishops were ex-officio members, and whose object was the free distribution of Bibles and Books of Common Prayer. But this old society, confident in its official status, had gone to sleep. When during the last decade of the 18th century the Welsh Methodists had appealed to it for the Bibles they needed, it had been unable to satisfy the request. Then the Methodists and their fellow Nonconformists took action, and with the assistance of the Anglican Evangelicals formed a large society for the printing and free circulation of Bibles. In a short time the society had become very wealthy. The founders had reckoned on an annual income of £10,000, in 1812 it exceeded £50,000.[2] From 1809 they built up their organization on a prearranged plan and aimed at the foundation of a branch in every county. But when in 1811 they contemplated the foundation of branches at Oxford and Cambridge the High Church Anglicans took alarm. They had no wish to see a breach made in the fortresses of the Establishment through which Methodism might find an entrance.

When, under Simeon's influence, 200 undergraduates undertook to found the branch at Cambridge, Marsh, a professor who since 1805 had waged a theological war against the Evangelicals, publicly denounced the scheme. To ask Anglicans, he said, to join a society whose object was the distribution of Bibles and nothing except Bibles, was to confuse the Anglican Church with the sects; for the doctrinal basis of the Church was not the Bible only, but the Bible with the official commentary contained in the Book of Common Prayer. Isaac Milner, who occupied a position of authority, being the master of a college and a dignitary of the Church, had no wish to appear the leader of an under-

[1] Its original title was "A Society for Promoting a more Extensive Circulation of the Scriptures at Home and Abroad." For this title, at the suggestion of Hughes, was substituted The British and Foreign Bible Society (Owen's *History of the British and Foreign Bible Society*, vol. i. p. 32).

[2] Canton, *History of the British and Foreign Bible Society*, vol. i. pp. 50–1. Owen, *History of the British and Foreign Bible Society*, vol. ii. p. 348, gives a different and a higher figure for the year 1813 (£76,455 1s.). The number of Bibles distributed was 202,580.

graduate revolt even in the cause of religion.[1] But Wilberforce agitated in London. And as a result of his activities, a member of the royal family, and chancellor of the University, the Duke of Gloucester accepted the presidency of the Cambridge branch. The branch was founded, and Milner, now sure of his ground, addressed the inaugural meeting. Another branch was founded at Oxford.[2] By 1814 there was not a county that did not possess its branch of the Bible Society. The High Church attack had failed. But the mutual antagonism persisted, and the old Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge continued to compete with the Bible Society.

The other incident belongs to 1813. Parliament was discussing the renewal of the East India Company's charter. It was a principle with the Company to respect the native religions. Not only did it abstain from missionary activity of any kind, it discouraged private missionary enterprise by every means in its power. Long had the Saints been scandalized by this policy of religious indifference. Twenty years earlier, at the previous renewal of the Charter, they had secured the adoption by the Commons of a series of resolutions affirming the obligation of Parliament to work for the religious welfare of the British possessions in India.[3] Since the resolutions had remained a dead letter, no Act being passed to carry them into execution, the Evangelicals proceeded to attempt the conquest of India by more direct methods. With Lord Teignmouth, Charles Grant and Robert Thornton, Evangelicalism penetrated to the heart of the East India Company. The Company thus inspired by a new spirit regarded the Christian missions in a more favourable light. These missions were the Danish Mission, established for a century past at Trinquebar, the Baptist Mission in Bengal, the Evangelical Mission on the Coromandel coast. The Company consulted Simeon in the appointment of their official chaplains, and appointed Henry Martyn, Buchanan and Thomason.[4] But in 1806 the influence thus directly exercised by the Evangelicals over the Company received a setback. A serious mutiny of the native sepoys occurred at Vellore. It was attributed by the Indian Government to

[1] Mary Milner, *Life of Isaac Milner*, pp. 463 sqq. Cf. Gunning, *Reminiscences of Cambridge*, vol. ii. pp. 278 *sqq*.

[2] *Life of Wilberforce*, vol. iii. pp. 559–60.

[3] *Ibid.*, vol. ii. pp. 24, 25, 27. See on pages 392–3 the text of the articles Wilberforce desired to introduce into the Charter.

[4] For the Evangelical chaplains see *Life of Mrs. Sherwood*, pp. 353 sqq.

the belief of the natives that the English were intending their forcible conversion to Christianity. The Saints, no longer in favour with the Company, realized the necessity of invoking further parliamentary assistance.[1] It is easy to anticipate the difficulties which confronted them in this course.

If they merely proposed to organize in India one or two dioceses, served by a regular hierarchy of priests, the High Church clergy would have no quarrel with their plans.[2] But in that case the Evangelicals would incur the suspicion of the Methodist and other Nonconformist missionaries, enthusiasts for the conversion of India, but by no means disposed to see Indian Christianity identified with episcopacy and submitted to the control of the Church of England. If, on the other hand, it were proposed to grant an absolute liberty of missionary propaganda in India and to open that vast territory to the missionaries' uncontrolled activities, the High Church party would be in arms against the proposal. The only missionaries then in India were either Baptists or Evangelicals, whom public opinion confused with the Nonconformists under the common designation of Methodist. And the bishops were little disposed to see the respectability of English religion compromised in Asia by the invasion of a host of unwashed enthusiasts. Moreover, although the influence of Perceval and Lord Harrowby had disposed the Government favourably to the Evangelicals, the temper of the majority in the House was uncertain. The Evangelicals were in an awkward predicament. Agitation outside the House was difficult. If a campaign of petitions were organized, the Dissenters would sign *en masse*. But for that very reason Anglicans would refuse to sign and the total im-

[1] For the Protestant missions to India and the Vellore disturbances see *Edinburgh Review*, April 1808, Art. 4, *Indian Missions* (vol. xii. pp. 151 sqq.). The article is hostile to the Evangelicals.

[2] See Pellew, *Life of Lord Sidmouth*, vol. iii. p. 103, Bishop Huntingdon's letter to Lord Sidmouth, April 17, 1813: "America had never been lost if an Episcopal Church had long ago been established there; and I am persuaded now, the strongest means through which you can secure any degree of real attachment to this country will be through the Episcopalians. . . . In my discourse before the 'Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts,' I made allusion to the policy of securing the affections of the rising generations in New South Wales by establishing an Episcopal Church, before separatists had prejudiced their minds against our constitution, civil and religious. On the same grounds of policy an Episcopal Church establishment seems essential in India."

pression produced on Parliament would be unfavourable. Notwithstanding these difficulties Wilberforce and his friends contrived to win a partial success.

They began by obtaining from the Cabinet and the Legislature the appointment of a bishop for India and three archdeacons.[1] There remained the more delicate problem of the mission. They secured the insertion into the Charter of a clause investing the Board of Control in London with authority to overrule decisions of the Company refusing a license to a missionary.[2] Though this fell far short of unfettered religious freedom, it was more than the Evangelicals had dared to hope. The first bishop sent to India, Middleton, was, as we should expect, a High Churchman. But he had the wisdom to adopt a conciliatory attitude towards the Evangelical missionaries and chaplains and administered his diocese to their entire satisfaction.

Moral Reforms.

Thus even in the interior reform of the Anglican Church the Evangelicals in spite of the opposition of the vast majority of the clergy always took the offensive and won many victories. And they were even more successful when they undertook the reform not of the Church but of the national morality. It is even arguable that in many ways the dubious position occupied by the Evangelicals on the border line between the Church and Nonconformity enlarged their sphere of action. Outside the Establishment they came to the assistance of the Methodists and other Nonconformists pietists, and protected them against the contempt and hostility of the clergy. And meanwhile, they exercised on the upper classes a direct influence akin to that exercised by the Methodists on the masses. In the 18th century the English aristocracy, gentry, and upper middle class had been Free Thinkers and loose livers, cynics, critics of established institutions and received ideas, republicans. As late as 1794 Isaac Milner, writing to a correspondent, expressed the disgust he felt for their conduct. "Now in general," he wrote, "the lower orders only regard such things" (the Gospel), "and the great and the high have, all over Europe, forgotten that they have

[1] 53 Geo. III, cap. 155, sec. 49.

[2] Ibid. sec. 43. For the circumstances under which the articles of the new Charter dealing with religion were passed, see especially the *Life of Wilberforce*, vol. iv. pp. 9 sqq., 100 sqq. The report of the sittings in the *Parliamentary Debates* is obviously careless and incomplete.

souls."[1] But the French Revolution had opened the eyes of the gentry and the wealthy traders to the risks to which their light attitude towards religion was exposing that social order of which they were the principal beneficiaries. And the Evangelicals appealed successfully to this new attitude to support their propaganda.

Even if a gentleman were personally devoid of justifying faith he respected its presence in his neighbours and encouraged it among the poor as the surest guarantee of law and order, if not of salvation. The names of Voltaire and Rousseau had become objects of universal execration. At the second entry of the Allies into Paris a leading article in *The Times* expressed its desire for the demolition of Voltaire's statue. "We would grind to powder the statue of the vain, obscene, heartless, atheistical Voltaire."[2] And a few years earlier during a period of public panic when the entire nation was in dread of a French invasion, Lord Exeter at his Stamford seat had made a public bonfire of the works of Voltaire, Rousseau, and other apostates from Christianity.[3] A few of the old Whigs were left to lament his change of public opinion. "The natural tendency of the excesses of the French Revolution," wrote Thomas Moore, "was to produce in the higher classes of England an increased reserve of manner, and, of course, a proportionate restraint on all within their circle, which have been fatal to conviviality and humour, and not very propitious to wit, subduing both manners and conversation to a sort of polished level, to rise above which is often thought almost as vulgar as to sink below it."[4] The aristocracy abandoned its former friendship with men of letters. Sport, politics, the preservation of social order, and morality, now constituted the only fashionable topics.

Formerly, in the days of William of Orange and Louis XIV, of Lord Chatham and Louis XV, the English regarded their country as the citadel of freedom at war with a "Turkish" despotism. No doubt during the first fifteen years of the 19th century they still cherished the same belief; but the word "liberty" no longer bore for them the sense it had borne for their fathers. They now understood by liberty restraint self-imposed and freely accepted as opposed to restraint forcibly imposed by the Government. England was contrasted with Napoleonic France, as being at once the home of liberty and of virtue. Probably the vast majority

[1] Mary Milner, *Life of Isaac Milner*, p. 100.
[2] *The Times*, July 10, 1815.
[3] *Journal of Lady Holland*, vol. ii. p. 25
[4] Moore, *Life of Sheridan*, p. 217.

of Englishmen, despite so much bitter strife of ideas and interests, would have agreed in this belief. "It is to the cultivation of the moral qualities," wrote the *Morning Chronicle*, the leading organ of the Liberal Opposition, "that England is indebted for her power and influence, from the want of them France may be mischievous but she never will be great."[1] And this change in the opinion entertained of themselves by the English was undoubtedly the result of the Methodist propaganda continued by the Evangelicals.

The nineteenth century Englishman was distinguished from the continental European, and it was a distinction of which he was proud, by a feature which, if superficial, was none the less characteristic, his strict observance of the Biblical Sabbath. And this Sabbath observance was unquestionably a direct result of the Methodist and Evangelical revival. The Saints had indeed never succeeded in obtaining from Parliament the legal prohibition of every kind of work and amusement for one entire day every week, nor even an Act prohibiting the publication of Sunday newspapers.[2] But they did not abandon the attempt. To obtain their end they had recourse to other means.

In 1787 the King had issued, at their instance, a proclamation condemning Sabbath-breaking, blasphemy, drunkenness, obscene literature, immoral amusements. They had proceeded to found for the enforcement of the proclamation a large and important society,[3] which included in its membership, the entire bench of bishops, members of both Houses, and wealthy merchants. "In our free state," wrote Wilberforce, "it is peculiarly needful to obtain these ends by the agency of some voluntary association; for thus only can those moral principles be guarded which of old were under the immediate protection of the Government. It" (the association) "is to us, like the ancient censorship, the guardian of the religion and morals of the people."[4] The Society, reorganized fifteen years later under the name of the Society for the Suppression of Vice, carried on a vigorous warfare against blasphemous or obscene publications, brothels and fortune tellers. But its principal object was the observance of the Sunday rest.[5] It kept its eye on the days chosen for markets, on the days when the aristocracy took its pleasures,

[1] *Morning Chronicle*, February 2, 1815

[2] *Life of Wilberforce*, vol. ii. pp. 338, 424.

[3] Its full title was "The Society for Enforcing the King's Proclamation against Immorality and Profaneness."

[4] *Life of Wilberforce*, vol. i. pp. 131–2.

[5] *Society for the Suppression of Vice*, 1825, pp. 7 sqq.

on the days when the militia manœuvred. When employers were inclined to oppose a movement which deprived them of labour one day every week the Evangelicals pointed out that it was to their advantage to command a religious and obedient proletariat.[1] Why had France, even the France of the counter-revolution, failed to learn the lesson? When Louis XVIII left England to return to his kingdom, he chose a Sunday to begin his journey. "What ingratitude," exclaimed Wilberforce, "and without temptation. What folly! Is this the Roman Catholic religion? Is it philosophical enlargement of mind? . . . How sad that none should have the courage to tell them. O shame, shame. Forgive, O Lord, and punish not our land for this ingratitude and cowardice."[2]

The activity of the Saints was displayed in other and less questionable forms. Although within the last twenty years duels between men in high position continued to engage the attention of the British public, among them a duel between the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition, and a duel between two members of the same Cabinet, the custom was obviously on the decline. In the Army and Navy duelling had been rigidly suppressed.[3] This was a result of Evangelical propaganda.[4] And to the same propaganda must be ascribed the protests raised every day more loudly against the brutal amusements not only of the lower classes, but of the aristocracy itself. Such were the fights between professional boxers to which the population of the large towns eagerly gathered. And there were cock-fights, bear-baiting and bull-

[1] Arthur Young, *Lincolnshire*, 1799, p. 438: "I know nothing better calculated to fill a country with barbarians ready for any mischief, than extensive commons and Divine Service only once a month. . . . To the scandal of the kingdom, of the legislature, of the executive, of the laws, therefore to the scandal of the magistracy, we see carriers' wagons and stage coaches crowding the roads on Sunday; add to this the fields full of workmen and where soon would divine worship be found? Do French principles make so slow a progress, that you should lend them such helping hands?"

[2] *Life*, vol. iv. p. 180; *Journal*, April 24, 1814.

[3] See in Brenton, *Life of Lord St. Vincent*, vol. i. pp. 409 sqq., the Admiralty prohibition of a duel to which Sir John Orde had challenged Lord St. Vincent. In 1812 a court martial cashiered a lieutenant "for scandalous and infamous behaviour" because he had tried to compel officers to settle their quarrels by a duel (*Examiner*, November 1, 1812).

[4] After Pitt's duel with Tierney, Wilberforce entertained the idea of procuring from Parliament a resolution of censure (*Life*, vol. ii. pp. 281–2).

baiting. A bear or a bull was tied to a post and worried by a pack of dogs, and the fight, cleverly interrupted at the right moment, could be continued over several days before the bear or bull was killed.[1] The Saints made repeated attempts to obtain from Parliament an Act protecting animals from human cruelty, and in the Upper House they had the warm support of Lord Erskine.[2] There were lengthy debates on the question in which the best speakers in Parliament took part. Windham was a zealous advocate of these cruel sports. He denounced the Methodist-Jacobin conspiracy to make the lower classes serious, gloomy, critical and discontented. He won the day. The Act demanded by the Evangelicals was not passed and bull-baitings were still carried on amid shouts of Windham and Liberty.[3] But was there any need for new legislation? In 1811 the Attorney-General was consulted and declared that in his opinion since bull-baiting took place on the King's highway and thus impeded traffic and rendered it dangerous, it constituted what English law terms a nuisance and was therefore an offence.[4] And was it even necessary to invoke the help of the Courts? The number of bull baitings and bear-baitings was decreasing every year.[5] The Evangelical propaganda had rendered legal prohibition superfluous.

[1] At a fight in Lancashire the right to strangle one's opponent was recognized, also to beat him to death with iron-rimmed clogs (Baines, *Lancashire*, vol. iii. pp. 75–6). The *Examiner* for February 19, 1815, contains an account of a sport similar to bull-baiting practised at Penzance. "On Saturday week, near Penzance, some men and boys, accompanied by *two young women*, amused themselves with *tail-piping* a dog, which they had procured for that purpose. Having fastened a bullock's horn to its tail, they turned the affrighted animal loose and followed it with brutal exaltation. . . . The practice of tail-piping or, as it is there called *pralling* dogs, we believe, ranks as an amusement next to bull-baiting in the estimation of the lower orders in the neighbourhood of Penzance."

[2] Campbell, *Lives of the Lord Chancellors*, vol. vi. pp. 607 sqq. See *Parl. Deb.*, H. of C., April 18, 1800; June 12, 13, 15, 1809. H. of L., May 15, June 2, 1809; April 17, May 8, 14, 1810. (*Parl. Hist.*, vol. xxxv. pp. 202 sqq. *Parl. Deb.*, vol. xiv. pp. 989, 1029, 1071; pp. 553, 830; vol. xvi. pp. 630, 846, 880.)

[3] *Life of Wilberforce*, vol. ii. pp. 365–6. Cf. Howitt, *Rural Life of England*, 1840, p. 522.

[4] Langford, *Century of Birmingham Life*, vol. ii. p. 270.

[5] This was the chief argument employed by the opponents of legal prohibition. See in the *Anti-Jacobin Review*, vol. vi. (1800), p. 218, an article on *A Letter to the Right Hon. William Windham on his late Opposition to the Bill to prevent Bull-baiting*, by an

The Evangelicals were also engaged in an attempt to protect the children of the working class against the oppression of employers. We have already seen the part they took in the legislation regulating the conditions under which pauper children worked in the factories.[1] They were equally concerned in an effort to improve by Act of Parliament the condition of the children employed as chimney sweeps in London.[2] The reform of the prison system and the penal code was not indeed directly due to the Evangelicals. Bentham was a disciple of Voltaire and Helvetius, Romilly a disciple of Bentham. But John Howard, the first prison reformer, had been a Dissenter, and Elizabeth Fry and William Allen, who devoted their lives to improving the treatment of criminals, were Quakers. Their philanthropic activity had not been uninfluenced by the Evangelical revival. And Wilberforce was in full sympathy with all these reformers. Every time Romilly brought forward in the Commons the abolition of the death penalty for an offence, Wilberforce intervened in the debate to support Romilly's proposal with his influence.[3] When in 1812 the revolutionary democrat, Sir John Burdett, demanded the abolition of flogging in the Army, Romilly rose in support of his motion, while making reservations as to several opinions voiced by Sir John in his speech, and Wilberforce in his turn expressed his assent with further reservations to the views of Romilly.[4] How came the Evangelicals to temper their austere code with so much mercy? Had they been influenced unconsciously by humanitarian Liberalism? Possibly, but the Evangelicals could defend themselves from the charge of inconsistency. "The

---

old M.P. (Sir Richard Hill). According to Sir William Pulteney (H. of C., April 18, 1800), bull-baiting, common in Staffordshire and Rutland, was unknown in Yorkshire and Northumberland.

[1] See above Book II, chap. ii. pp. 269 sqq.

[2] An Act had already been passed in 1788 (28 Geo. III, cap. 48). From *The Philanthropist* we learn of four societies founded respectively in 1773, 1780, 1788, and 1799 to protect these chimney sweeps (vol. v. pp. 341–2), and of another founded in 1803, of which the Bishop of Durham was president (vol. vii. pp. 27 sqq.). A Bill which passed the Commons in 1814 was thrown out by the Lords. See also H. of C., June 5, 25, 1817 (*Parl. Deb.*, vol. xxxvi. pp. 889–90, 1155–7).

[3] H. of C., May 1, 1810 (*Parl. Deb.*, vol. xvi. pp. 773–4); *Life of Wilberforce*, vol. iii. pp. 440, 444, 504.

[4] H. of C., March 13, 1812 (*Parl. Deb.*, vol. xxi. p. 1287). "Most vilely used in the newspapers," Wilberforce remarks in his *Journal*, March 23 (*Life*, vol. iv. p. 18).

barbarous custom of hanging," Wilberforce had written as early as 1787, "has been tried too long, and with the success which might have been expected from it. The most effectual way to prevent greater crimes is by punishing the smaller, and by endeavouring to repress that general spirit of licentiousness, which is the parent of every species of vice."[1] It was by a severe public morality that the Evangelicals hoped to render the criminal code unnecessary.

The Abolition of the Slave Trade.

Among all the reforms of which the Evangelical party were justly proud, the most glorious was the abolition of the slave trade. The agitation dated from the period between the American War of Independence and the French Revolution. About 1788 the abolitionists expected a speedy victory from the skilful organization of their committees of propaganda, the wide circulation of their pamphlets, their public meetings, their petitions. But the French Revolution postponed their triumph. The abolition of the slave trade was identified with total emancipation, and that in turn with Jacobinism. And the Convention seriously compromised the friends of the negroes with the British public, when it conferred French citizenship on Wilberforce in recognition of his campaign against the slave trade. Year after year from 1789 to 1800, Wilberforce and his friends made vain efforts to obtain even a gradual or a partial abolition. From 1800 to 1804 they kept silence, judging it the most prudent course to abstain from any further proposals. Later when the anti-Jacobin scare had become weaker their propaganda regained ground in Government circles. In 1805, a few months before his death, Pitt forbade by an Order in Council the importation of slaves into the colonies recently conquered. In 1806 the Fox-Grenville Ministry introduced a series of measures which led up to the passage in the following year of an Act of Total Abolition.[2]

The legislation thus obtained must not be allowed to remain a dead letter. To secure the execution of the Act Wilberforce and his allies founded the African Institution.[3] They obtained from the Government the establishment of a strict watch on the African coast to prevent an illegal traffic

[1] *Diary*, June 12, 1787 (*Life*, vol. i. p. 131).

[2] 46 Geo. III, cap. 52; 46 Geo. III, cap. 119; 47 Geo. III, sess. 1, cap. 36.

[3] *Life of Wilberforce*, vol. iii. p. 360; *Life of William Allen*, vol. i. pp. 85, 86, 91, 112, 138 sqq, 184 sqq., 223 sqq., 258.

in slaves by British subjects. They obtained Government support for the colony they had established at Sierra Leone to present the world with an example of a European colony among a negro population which was not based on slavery.[1] They obtained further official action to prevent the illegal introduction of new slaves into the British West Indies, and the passage in 1811 of an Act of Parliament punishing traffic in slaves with fourteen years' deportation.[2] The naval victories of Great Britain rendered their task easier. Every time a French colony was occupied by the English, so much more ground was lost to the slave trade. And since the Governments of Spain and Portugal had become dependent on Great Britain, it might be hoped that Britain would force them to abolish the slave trade in their colonies. On the eve of peace the House of Commons by a unanimous vote enjoined the Cabinet to solicit from all the sovereigns of Europe the immediate and universal abolition of the slave trade.[3]

For the moment the resolution was fruitless. Lord Castlereagh, who had been one of the few obstinate opponents of abolition in the Commons, was satisfied to obtain in the first Treaty of Paris the promise of Louis XVIII that he would take the necessary steps to effect abolition at the end of five years. Thus the slave trade was readmitted for a period of five years into all the colonies now restored to France from which it had been banished, as men had believed, for ever.[4] It was impossible to refuse recognition to a treaty definitely concluded and duly signed: but how then could Spain and Portugal be refused the five years' postponement granted to France? All that Lord Liverpool and Lord Castlereagh could do to satisfy public opinion was to obtain at Vienna a prohibition of the slave trade along the entire west coast of Africa from Cape Formosa. But Napoleon on his return from Elba delivered the abolitionists from the impasse. To concilate Liberal opinion he decreed the abolition of the slave trade. This made it easy, when the second

[1] In 1791. *Life of Wilberforce*, vol. i, pp. 305, 307, 323. Its success was not great. See complaints in the Commons, April 8, 1811 (*Parl. Deb.*, vol. xix. pp. 731 sqq.).

[2] 51 Geo. III, cap. 23. Bill introduced by Brougham (H. of C., March 5, 1811, *Parl. Deb.*, vol. xix. pp. 233 sqq.).

[3] H. of C., May 2, 1814 (*Parl. Deb.*, vol. xxvii. p. 641.)

[4] See the important debates in the Commons on June 6, 1814 (*Parl. Deb.*, vol. xxvii. p. 1083). See also H. of L., June 27th. H. of C., June 27th; H. of L., June 28, 29, 30, July 11, 14, 1814 (*Parl. Deb.*, vol. xxviii. pp. 268, 299, 362, 417, 466, 655, 699.

Treaty of Paris was concluded with Louis XVIII, to avoid the mistake made in 1814 and to obtain immediate abolition.[1]

The abolition of the slave trade was now complete. We have called it the work of the Evangelicals. The statement, however, requires qualification. The Evangelicals had possessed allies whose power was far, very far, from negligible. That the Methodists, like Wesley himself, had always been convinced abolitionists scarcely detracts from the importance of the part played by the Evangelicals, for between the Evangelicals and the Methodists the relationship was extremely close. Evangelicalism was, after all, but a variety of Methodism. But side by side with the Methodists and the Evangelicals, the Dissenters of the old school had fought from the beginning for the abolition of the slave trade. The Baptists as a body had supported the movement.[2] So also had the Quakers. In 1787 two-thirds of the Abolitionist Committee were Quakers.[3] Now, among these Dissenters were many Socinians, many Rationalists, some who were practically Deists. In the United States the abolitionist movement was born of an alliance between the Quakers and the adherents of natural religion, Franklin, Tom Paine and their disciples. And since the opinion of the majority in the British Parliament from 1788, an opinion more or less openly expressed, was in favour of abolition, why was it that the arrival in office of Fox, an anti-clerical Whig, effected a settlement of the question within a few months?[4] If Fox had not then become Premier, but the Tory party had held office continuously from 1784 to 1815, can we feel any confidence that one or other among Pitt's mediocre successors, the Duke of Portland, Perceval, or Lord Liverpool, would have taken the initiative and abolished the slave trade? Would not Rose and Lord Castlereagh have opposed the reform? And in view of the manner in which parliamentary

[1] We realize the importance which the question possessed for the British Government when we see Lord Liverpool on July 7, 1815, little over a fortnight after Waterloo, urge Lord Castlereagh to insist on this point in his negotiations with King Louis (Yonge, *Life of Lord Liverpool*, vol. ii. p. 189.)

[2] Clarkson, *History of the Abolition*, vol. i. pp. 443, 568–9.

[3] Clarkson, *ibid.*, vol. i. pp. 110 sqq., 442, 444–5. For the part played by the Quakers, cf. *Life of William Allen*, *passim*.

[4] Cf. the speech of G. Philips, H. of C., June 27, 1814 (*Parl. Deb.*, vol. xxvii. p. 289), and Wilberforce, *Journal*, June 29, 1806: "Oh that I might be the instrument of bringing him to the knowledge of Christ! I have entertained now and then a hope of it. . . . I quite love Fox for his generous and warm fidelity to the Slave Trade cause" (*Life*, vol. iii. p. 268).

institutions functioned in England at the beginning of the 19th century can we conceive a parliamentary majority capable of imposing so radical a measure on an apathetic or hostile administration?

Obviously the Evangelical party cannot claim the sole glory of this decisive blow to slavery. Neither Thomas Clarkson nor Granville Sharpe belonged to the party, and their part in the abolitionist campaign was as considerable as that of Wilberforce himself. In fact Evangelicalism played here a rôle similar to that which it has played in all the humanitarian movements of modern England. It constituted a link, effected a transition between Anglicanism and Dissent, between the governing classes and the general public, as represented by the great middle class. It prevented the formation of a reactionary group and won the support of the gentry and nobility, sometimes even of a member of the Royal Family, for a movement initiated by shopkeepers and preachers. And the action of the party was decisive in securing from Parliament the legislation which embodied the dictates of the national conscience.

Till 1806 it had acted under great difficulties. There were so many prejudices to be overcome, so many interests were compromised. But from the passage of the decisive Act of 1806 the anti-slavery campaign enjoyed a free course. Henceforward the entire British Empire had an interest in the universal abolition of the slave trade. Failing this England would find that, carried away by an outburst of humanitarian zeal, she had acted against her commercial interest and had ruined her colonies for the profit of their rivals. Hence the universal outburst of public opinion in 1814 whose violence was so disconcerting to the lukewarmness of ministers and diplomatists. "I was not aware," wrote Wellington, whom long absence abroad had made a stranger in his native land "(till I had been some time here) of the degree of frenzy existing here about the slave trade."[1] "The nation," wrote Lord Castlereagh on the eve of signing the Treaty of Paris, "is bent upon this object. I believe there is hardly a village that has not met and petitioned upon it: both Houses of Parliament are pledged to press it: and the ministers must make it the basis of their policy."[2]

[1] Wellington to Sir Henry Wellesley, London, July 29, 1814 (*Suppl. Disp.*, vol. ix. p. 165). Cf. three letters from Wellington to Wilberforce, December 1814 (*Papers of Wilberforce*, pp. 144 sqq.).

[2] *Correspondence of Lord Castlereagh*, vol. x. p. 73, Lord Castlereagh to Sir Henry Wellesley, August 1, 1814.

THE JEWS, THE SCOTTISH PRESBYTERIANS, THE CATHOLICS, THE QUESTION OF CATHOLIC EMANCIPATION

Other Religious Bodies. The Jews.

We have described the influence exercised by the Methodist revival on the religious life of the nation. We have witnessed the Dissenting sects awaking from their lethargy and increasing enormously the numbers of their adherents, and in the Establishment we have seen the Low Church party operative as an energetic minority. We have described the wider influence exercised by the Evangelical revival through the mediation of the churches upon the morality of the entire nation, the growth of a spirit at once philanthropic and conservative, a spirit of social reform and individual piety. But there existed in the United Kingdom religious bodies upon whom this Evangelical movement had exercised no influence whatsoever. What then had been their influence on the national intelligence and morality?

Let us turn first to the Jews. There were scarcely more than 20,000 Jews in the country, domiciled in London and the large provincial towns.[1] But their numbers were being daily increased by the immigration of Jews from Portugal or Germany. Their wealth was constantly increasing and was no longer concealed. In every town where there was a Jewish colony, sumptuous edifices were replacing the old synagogues formerly hidden away in the slums.[2] They had long been exposed to the persecution which was their universal lot, and had not yet obtained the right of naturalization on the same terms as Christians. But their unpopularity was on the decline. In 1810 Cobbett, an anti-Semite, expressed his indignation that in modern dramas the part of moralist

[1] F. H. Goldsmid, *Remarks on the Civil Disabilities of British Jews*, 1830, pp. 69 sqq., and J. E. Blunt, *Jews in England*, 1830, p. 75, give the following statistics: In London, 18,000; in the rest of England, 9,000. Total 27,000. These figures, which are extremely arbitrary, were based on (1) The number of Jewish burials in London, (2) The supposition that the number of Jews in the provinces must be at least equal to half the number of the London Jews.

[2] For instance, the Steel Street synagogue was erected at Liverpool in 1808 (Baines, *Lancashire*, vol. iv. p. 107); the Severn Street synagogue at Birmingham in 1809 (Langford, *Century of Birmingham Life*, vol. ii. p. 237); and at Manchester a synagogue was built in Halliwell Street (Margoliouth, *The Jews in England*, vol. iii. p. 124).

and virtuous sage was often given to a Jew.[1] The system of national loans had constantly compelled Chancellors of the Exchequer to have recourse to their assistance. Scions of the Whig aristocracy, plunged in debt, had opened to the Jews the door of good society in return for pecuniary advances. And, after all, anti-Semitic prejudice cannot be so strong in a community of traders and bankers, as in a nation whose organization is military, must be weaker in a country where a crowd of sects live peaceable side by side than in a country where the national religion is imposed on every citizen.

A series of famous names illustrates the importance of the English Jews in the life of their adopted country. To the business world belonged Gideon Sampson, the celebrated banker of the period of the Seven Years' War, whose son became an Irish peer, the two brothers Goldsmid, ruined in 1810, and Nathan Meyer Rothschild. Employed to arrange all financial transactions between Great Britain and the continental Governments, Rothschild in 1815 was king of the Stock Exchange. But it was not only in finance that Jews won distinction. Gomperz was a first-rate mathematician; Isaac Disraeli, father of the future statesman, a distinguished man of letters; Ricardo founded a new school of economics. But none of these men, whether financiers or thinkers, engaged in any distinctively Jewish propaganda, religious or political, peaceful or revolutionary. Often they even abandoned their religion. Gideon Sampson's family became Christian, Isaac Disraeli allowed his children to be baptized, Ricardo was himself a convert to Christianity.[2] In short, the Jews as a body appear to have exercised no collective influence on the religious life of Britain. And in this they were distinguished from two other religious societies, both of whom exerted a profound influence on the national character and which therefore we must consider at greater length. They were the Scottish Presbyterians and the Catholics of Great Britain and Ireland.

The Scottish Presbyterians.

North of the Tweed the Methodist propaganda exercised practically no effect. Wesley often visited Scotland. But his account in the *Journal* of these northern tours leaves us with

[1] Political Register, *October* 8, 1818 (vol. xviii. p. 522). See especially Cumberland's Comedy, *The Jew*.

[2] According to Margoliouth (*The Jews in England*, vol. iii. p. 125), these conversions were numerous. In Manchester many Jews attended Socinian chapels instead of the synagogue, and even orthodox Christian churches.

the impression that he was in a foreign land whose manners and needs he had the greatest difficulty to understand.[1] Whitefield had preached in Scotland with more success. Aided by a number of Presbyterian ministers he had conducted several revivals on a large scale.[2] Nevertheless, Methodism took no root in Scotland. In 1815 there were at most 9,000 Scottish Methodists as against 200,000 in England.[3] In Scotland the sermons of Wesley and Whitefield did not, as in England, minister to the needs of the moment. Scotland had different religious traditions, other desires.

The history of Scottish Presbyterianism throughout the entire 18th century is the history of a stubborn contest between two powerful parties in the Church, the Popular party and the Liberal party. The Popular party was the orthodox party. It maintained the obligation for all members of the Church of Scotland to accept in its integrity the dogmatic system of Calvinism. But it was termed popular, because it also defended against the attacks of the opposite party the right of the faithful to elect their pastors. For Calvinism is pre-eminently democratic Christianity. What could the Methodist preachers from England do to assist the Popular party in the Presbyterian Church? They were either Wesleyans or disciples of Whitefield. In the former case they were Arminians, and on that ground alone tainted in the eyes of the Scottish pietists with heresy, if not with infidelity. In the latter case their orthodoxy indeed was beyond question. But they brought with them no new truth and could only offer to a national party, whose organization was already powerful, the unwelcome aid of the foreigner. And whether followers of Wesley or of Whitefield, they were either in favour of episcopacy or indifferent to forms of Church government. Hence their message, confined to the sphere of personal religion, was out of harmony with the republican zeal of the orthodox Presbyterians. And the abuses against which they waged war in England were on the whole absent in Scotland. There a clergy, provided with adequate stipends, performed its duties conscientiously.[4] Pluralism, non-residence, miserably paid curacies were unknown.

[1] See especially *Journal*, June 2, 22, 23, 1766 (*Works*, vol. iii. pp. 239, 242).

[2] Tyerman, *Life of Whitefield*, vol. i. pp. 497 sqq. and *passim*.

[3] 6,000 members, 9,000 including children; 11 circuits, 18 preachers (Sinclair, *Scotland*, vol. iv. p. 9).

[4] An Act of 1810 (50 Geo. III, cap. 84) raised the minimum stipend of a Scottish minister to £150. The Treasury defrayed the necessary cost (Grub, *Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*, vol. iv. p. 156).

Would the Methodists conduct Sabbatarian propaganda in Edinburgh or Glasgow? On this point Scotland set the example to England. The scrupulous observance in Scotland of the law of Sunday rest was proverbial.

Meanwhile, in the Presbyterian Church of Scotland the Popular party steadily lost ground to their Liberal opponents. An unending and embittered strife was engaged between the two parties in those half-clerical, half-lay assemblies by which the Church was governed. The 900 Scottish parishes were divided into districts, each with its lay president, its elder. And each parish was governed by a council of elders under the presidency, the "moderation" it was termed, of the minister of the parish. Several parishes were united in a presbytery, to which each parish sent a minister and an elder. The presbytery, acting as an ecclesiastical court of second instance, decided on appeal cases judged previously by the parochial councils. But its specific function was the approbation of candidates for ordination, the delivery of licenses to preach. Several presbyteries were grouped to form a provincial synod. At the head of the entire system was the General Assembly, which consisted of representatives of all the Presbyteries together with representatives of the royal boroughs and the universities.

The Assembly met once a year in Edinburgh. A Royal Commissioner, the head of a noble family, presided and opened the discussions by an "address from the throne." A debate on the address followed. The Assembly then proceeded to the transaction of business, either in committee or in full session, and it was decided whether a particular question of detail or principle, of organization or doctrine, should be submitted to the examination of the presbyteries. Since the Act of Union in 1707 had deprived Edinburgh of her Parliament, religious disputes had kept alive in Scotland party spirit and political passions. The meeting of the General Assembly played the same rôle in the social life of Edinburgh, as the meeting of Parliament in the social life of London.[1] Through the channel of the Synods and Presbyteries these disputes engaged the attention of the entire country and penetrated to the most remote districts. Thus religion joined hands with law to develop in Scotland a logical and juristic temper. Unlike English Evangelicalism, the Christianity of the Scottish Presbyterian was intellectual and argumentative. And his observation of the Scotch might well confirm Wesley in his dislike of theological disputes. Reasoning leads to rationalism and unbelief.

[1] Cockburn, *Life of Jeffrey*, pp. 179 sqq.

As was pointed out above, the dispute between the two parties in the Church of Scotland presented two aspects. One of these was the dogmatic. From the beginning of the 18th century the orthodox Calvinists suffered a series of defeats. The majority in the Assembly refused to condemn books delated by the orthodox party as Arian or Socinian, or even condemned books whose extreme Calvinism had been denounced by the Liberals. A few orthodox ministers seceded in their indignation from the national Church in 1733 and founded a sect which was soon itself split into hostile sects.[1] But their exodus only strengthened the position of the Liberal party within the Church. In the Universities, the seminaries of the Scottish clergy, the triumph of the Liberals was even easier. Their predominance dates from 1737 when, in the University of Glasgow, Hutcheson began to teach natural religion and the ethics of the greatest happiness of the greatest number.[2] After this came the period of Adam Smith and Reid at Glasgow, of Robertson and Ferguson at Edinburgh. And though Reid refuted Hume he did not excommunicate him. He was, on the contrary, Hume's personal friend. "If you," he wrote to Hume, "write no more on morals, politics and metaphysics, I am afraid we shall be in want of subjects."[3] And Reid was a member of the party which protected Hume against the persecution of the bigots and prevented his citation before the bar of the Assembly, as the orthodox desired, to hear the solemn condemnation of his teaching.

Beside dogma, the dispute turned on ecclesiastical organization. Both parties accused each other of destroying the balance of the Presbyterian system. The Liberals charged the orthodox with attempting to transform a Presbyterian into a Congregational Church, by making each parish an autonomous religious unit with free choice of its pastor and uncontrolled by any superior authority. The Church of Scotland, they urged, was not an anarchic Church which fulfilled the ideal of the English Independents, but a democratic Church whose pastors and faithful were implicitly pledged to submit to the majority decisions of the hierarchy

[1] The Burghers and Antiburghers in 1746 (Grub, *Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*, vol. iv. p. 75). The Antiburghers were themselves split in 1804 by the formation of the Constitutional Associate Presbytery (*id. ibid.*, pp. 150 sqq.); the Burghers, in 1799, by the formation of the Associate Presbytery (*id. ibid.*, pp. 164–5).

[2] Rae, *Life of Adam Smith*, pp. 12–13; W. R. Scott, *Francis Hutcheson*, pp. 57 sqq.

[3] Hunt, *Religious Thoughts*, vol. iii. p. 324.

of Assemblies by which the Church was governed. The Popular party replied by declaring that they would willingly have obeyed the decisions of the Synods and the General Assembly, had not the original constitution of the Church been gravely tampered with in other respects. An Act of 1711[1] passed in London had established in Scotland the system of lay patronage and given the Crown or the great landowners the right to appoint the parochial ministers. Therefore they were justified in their revolt against the decisions of a majority of pastors who had not been regularly elected by the people according to the original system. Here also in the 18th century the Liberal party triumphed. It was in vain that the Popular party secured certain modifications of the Act of 1711, and a resolution of the Assembly in 1736, that in the choice of ministers account should be taken of the wishes of the congregation.[2] The Liberals ignored the resolution of 1736, applied the Act of 1711 to the letter, forcibly imposed on unwilling parishes ministers chosen by lay patrons, and finally compelled a number of Popular ministers to secede and found a new separatist Church.

Such was the trend of events throughout the 18th century. The Liberals successfully maintained their position against the orthodox, and supported an aristocratic system of Church government because it protected them against the fanatical Calvinism of the lower classes. But at the close of the century the situation entirely changed. After the French Revolution opposition between the cause of the people and the cause of intellectual freedom was no longer possible. The Popular party insensibly tended to become the champion of the rights of the individual reason, and under the leadership of Sir Harry Moncrieff began to regain the ascendancy in the Church. In 1805 it was proposed to annul the nomination to the chair of mathematics at Edinburgh University of John Leslie, a doctor, who was accused of having adopted in his scientific treatises the philosophy of Hume. The affair made a powerful stir in Edinburgh society. And it was the Popular party who, in alliance with Dugald Stewart and the intelligentsia, won the victory for Leslie.[3] Does this mean that the Popular party

[1] 10 Anne, cap. 12.

[2] MacKerrow, *History of the Secession Church*, 1841, p. 97.

[3] For the affair of Leslie see a minutely detailed account in the *Edinburgh Review* for October 1805, No. 13, *Professor Stewart's Statement of Facts* (vol. vii. pp. 113 sqq.). The article is by Horner; also Grub, *Ecclesiastical History of Scotland* (vol. iv. pp. 153–5).

in becoming Liberal repudiated its ancient Calvinist tradition? Far from it. In 1811 Thomas MacCrie published a *Life of John Knox*. The appearance of the book marked an epoch in the history of Scottish thought. Hitherto it had been the fashion in Liberal circles to depreciate the memory of the man who introduced Calvinistic puritanism into Scotland. MacCrie's book was a defence of Knox by an enlightened democrat. It had scarcely appeared before the leading Liberal organ, the *Edinburgh Review*, took the book under its patronage.[1]

In this way came into being in the Scotland of the early 19th century a Rationalist Protestantism or Intellectual Calvinism, a faithful expression of the paradox inherent in the national mentality. For that mentality betrays a curiously double character. On the one hand Scotland is the home of philosophic idealism, of intuitionist metaphysics. But it is equally a country scrupulously observant of the religious traditions of the past, a country where every Sunday the current of social life ceases to flow, every street is empty, every church filled to overflowing. And yet in spite of these contrasts the national character is eminently homogeneous. All Scotsmen, whatever their religious persuasion, are Scottish and proud to be Scottish. They are all filled with admiration for their fellow countrymen as a body and with contempt for the English. Men whose attitude towards Christian dogma is of the freest feel an affection for religious customs which are as much national as religious. And those even who have rejected these practices are still attached more or less consciously, more or less avowedly to moral traditions inherited from the religion of their

---

For the aversion with which the spirit which prevailed in the Scottish universities inspired the English Evangelicals, see *Life of Wilberforce* (vol. ii. p. 142). "Against Dundas I recommend and will cultivate in myself a propensity to direct hostilities. Reared as he has been in the small metaphysics of Scotland, and cramped by his country's imitative adoption of French philosophy, I can only see in the influence of such a man the approaches of French morals, French politics, French atheism" (*ibid.*, vol. iii. p. 229). "His connexion with Dundas was Pitt's great misfortune. Dundas was a loose man, and had been rather a disciple of the Edinburgh school in his youth."

[1] *Edinburgh Review*, July 1812, No. 39, Art. 1, *MacCrie's Life of John Knox* (vol. xx. pp. 1 sqq.). Remark, however, the qualifications of MacCrie's thesis made four years later by the same review, September 1816, No. 53, Art. 8, *Toleration of the Reformers* (vol. xxvii. pp. 163 sqq.).

fathers. Instances are not far to seek. Thomas Erskine, the friend of Maurice and the Duchesse de Broglie, was a Free Thinker professing strange religious views peculiar to himself and taking no part in the worship of any religious body. But all his life long he would speak with emotion of the "Calvinian atmosphere" in which he had been brought up and of a religion "which makes God all and the thought of Him all in all, and makes the creature almost as nothing before Him."[1] Thomas Carlyle refused to enter the ministry. He no longer believed in Christianity. But he remained a mystic and was fully aware that he owed his mysticism to the education of his home, to the separatist sect, of which his parents were members, to the preachers of that sect—"men so like evangelists in modern vesture . . . I have nowhere met with among Protestant or Papal clergy in any country in the world," and to the humble village chapel, "rude, rustic, bare," . . . "but more sacred to me than the biggest cathedral."[2] And he will consecrate his entire life as a writer to the celebration of Puritan heroism. But the case of James Mill is perhaps the most typical. Mill was an avowed Free Thinker, an opponent of the Christian creed, especially in its Calvinist form. But read his son's picture of his father: "He had scarcely any belief in pleasure. . . . He deemed very few 'pleasures' worth the price which, at least in the present state of society, must be paid for them. . . . He thought human life a poor thing at best, after the freshness of youth and of unsatisfied curiosity had gone by. . . . For passionate emotions of all sorts, and for everything which has been said or written in exaltation of them, he professed the greatest contempt. He regarded them as a form of madness."[3] This utilitarian is a Stoic, even an ascetic, and we cannot fail to recognize in his instinctive asceticism the stamp of his early education.

The life led by Thomas Carlyle and James Mill during their childhood and youth was the life of every poor Scotsman who desired to win through to success. Parents, schoolmaster and minister determine that he shall enter the ministry. They teach him reading, writing, arithmetic, and elementary Latin. He is then sent to the University to prepare for Ordination. But as he follows the lectures of Dugald Stewart, Thomas Brown, Playfair and Leslie, the student feels his orthodoxy undermined, abandons all thought of

[1] *Letters of Thomas Erskine*, ed. Hanna, 1877, vol. ii. pp. 321, 369.
[2] J. A. Froude, *Thomas Carlyle, A History of the First Forty Years of his Life*, vol. i. pp. 11–12.
[3] John Stuart Mill, *Autobiography*, pp. 48, 49.

the ministry, and in search of an arena more worthy of his ambition goes up to London, where he will become a political pamphleteer or journalist, a Government official, a statesman. He reaches the capital assured of his intellectual and moral superiority to the English around him. He does not distinguish between these two diverse species of excellence, and is apt therefore to believe that, if he appears better endowed intellectually than others, it is simply that his industry has enabled him to extract more profit from intellectual endowments common to all men alike. And this determination, as he is well aware, is the gift of his Calvinist education. In this way the Scottish Presbyterians, hard on others, hard on themselves, unwearied thinkers, contributed to nineteenth-century England an element of intellectual virility which would have been wanting had the country been entirely abandoned to the emotionalism of the Wesleys and the Wilberforces.

The Catholics of Ireland and Great Britain.

Equally with the Scottish Presbyterians, though for different, indeed opposite reasons, Catholics turned a deaf ear to the Methodist preacher. Seventeen times Wesley crossed St. George's Channel and traversed on horseback the whole of Ireland. The conversion of Catholic Ireland was his avowed ambition. But whatever proselytes were made in Ireland by the Wesleyan, and still more by the Calvinistic Methodists, all belonged to the colonists of English or Scottish origin, were Protestants, Dissenters, Presbyterians, Quakers.[1] Wesley himself admitted that out of every hundred Catholics ninety-nine remained faithful to the religion of their fathers. In 1814 Wakefield declared that he did not know a single instance in which a Catholic had been converted.[2]

When the itinerant preachers of Methodism, nicknamed the Swaddlers or Cavalry Preachers, traversed the villages in pairs, preaching the one in English, the other in Gaelic, the Catholic priests forbade their flocks to attend their sermons. If on occasion the prohibition were not obeyed,

[1] Letter to Blackwell, Dublin, August 13, 1747 (*Works*, vol. xii. p. 157).

[2] Wesley, *Journal*, August 15, 1747 (*Works*, vol. ii. p. 67); Wakefield, *Ireland*, vol. ii. p. 67. The extreme paucity of sincere conversions among the common people does not contradict what has been said already of conversions for interested and political motives frequent in the 18th century among the wealthy.

the priests took a whip and dispersed the audience.[1] In 1816, in County Kerry, a woman named Catherine Healy called herself "the Holy Woman" and claimed to be the recipient of new revelations of a doctrinal character. But the Bishop of Limerick condemned her in a pastoral letter read from the pulpit, and Catherine Healy found no disciples.[2] What, indeed, was the need to which the Methodist evangel could appeal? The common people of Ireland, unlike the English poor, possessed a poor, resident and conscientious clergy, and a cult saturated with the miraculous, and speaking daily to the imagination.[3] Catholic devotion was impervious to Protestant piety.

In the United Kingdom as a whole the Catholics were a minority, though a powerful minority, in Ireland a majority. What, then, was the proportion of Catholics to the entire population of Ireland? It is difficult to answer with any approach to accuracy. According to Newenham they constituted four-fifths of the population; six-sevenths, or even more than that, according to Wakefield. Their numbers exceeded four, possibly five, millions.[4] Only in the north-east, in the district around Belfast, did the number of Protestants equal the number of Catholics. In the centre, the west, and the south the Protestants were a mere handful. This Catholic population consisted of an aristocracy, ancient and poverty-stricken, for it had been stripped of its possessions by the English invaders—an aristocracy ill-educated indeed, but men of honour and universally respected—a middle class comprising numerous wealthy members, the graziers, or middlemen of whom we have already spoken, a class which the poor hated and everyone despised, and finally a vast proletariat ignorant, miserably poor, superstitious and disorderly. The organization of the Church had preserved the form it had possessed when the Catholic Church was the official Church of the country.[5]

[1] Wakefield, *Ireland*, vol. ii. p. 555.

[2] *Annual Register*, 1816, Chron., p. 26.

[3] See the interesting reflexions suggested by John Jebb to Southey when the latter was preparing his Life of Wesley (Forster, *Life of Jebb*, p. 134).

[4] For the number of Irish Catholics see Wakefield, *Ireland*, vol. ii. pp. 585 sqq., 591 sqq., 630–1. Cf. *Edinburgh Review*, July 1806 (vol. viii. p. 317); October 1807 (vol. xi. p. 122).

[5] For the organization of the Catholic Church in Ireland, see Wakefield, *Ireland*, vol. ii. pp. 548 sqq.; also *Memoirs and Correspondence of Viscount Castlereagh*, vol. iv. pp. 97 sqq., *Abstract of the Returns of the several Roman Catholic Bishops of Ireland relative to the State of their Church*, 1801.

There were twenty-six dioceses, governed by four archbishops and twenty-two bishops. The dioceses were regularly divided into parishes, which were served by 1,000 parish priests assisted by over 800 curates or coadjutors. The obedience displayed by the common people of Ireland towards their priests was regarded as the extreme of servility, and Protestant landlords often made use of the priest to maintain order. If a theft had been committed they applied to the priest to discover the thief. If a popular rising threatened, they would consult with the priest on the best means of preventing it. Nevertheless, the priests were well aware that the docility of their flocks was not unlimited.

If the Irish loved their clergy, it was not only because they were good Catholics; it was also, and this perhaps was the predominant motive, because they saw in their priests the defenders of their nationality. To be sure the Catholic Church in Ireland did not possess the venerable privileges enjoyed by her Gallican sister. While Charles Edward, the Jacobite Pretender, lived, episcopal nominations were in his hands. And after his death the Irish officers, in the pay of the great continental Governments, had provided through the embassies many candidates with an effective recommendation. But about 1785 propaganda had decided that henceforward no account should be taken of recommendations by the laity. When a see fell vacant it was the custom to hold a meeting of the clergy of the diocese which postulated the appointment of one of their number to replace the late prelate. The bishops of the province also met and submitted to the Pope a list of two or three names; and, practically speaking, the Pope always gave effect to these local recommendations.

Stripped of all their former possessions the Irish Catholic clergy depended exclusively for their support on the voluntary offerings of the faithful. Wakefield calculated that the Irish people, besides paying tithe to the Established Church, gave £500,000 to the Catholic Church.[1] The bishops received from the lower clergy what was termed the cathedraticum, procuration or proxy. Parish priests regularly contributed two guineas, curates a guinea. They increased their income by reserving to themselves *in commendam* the titles of one or two parishes, and by selling marriage licenses. From all these sources united the best-paid bishop in Ireland received an income of £550. The average episcopal income did not exceed £300.[2] The parish priests, who them-

[1] *Ireland*, vol. ii. pp. 562–4.
[2] *Memoirs and Correspondence of Lord Castlereagh*, vol. iv. pp. 97-8.

selves kept curates at a fixed stipend, received the offerings of their parishioners at Christmas and Easter. These offerings, payable in money or in kind, and whose amount varied according to the means of each family, ran from a shilling to a guinea. At a marriage they received an additional offering. Half the year they dined with their parishioners. Their average income, which varied enormously in different localities, may be estimated at £65.[1] Obviously no legislation guaranteed to the Irish priest the enjoyment of this income. He was therefore financially dependent upon his flock.

At times this dependence was felt as a heavy burden. "The priest," in the words of a contemporary witness, "must follow the impulse of the popular wave, or be left behind on the beach to perish. . . . 'Live with me and live as I do; oppress me not with superior learning or refinement, take thankfully what I choose to give you, and earn it by compliance with my political creed or conduct.' Such, when justly translated, is the language of the Irish cottager to his priest."[2] However diverse their respective constitutions, the Catholic Church in Ireland and the Presbyterian Church of Scotland possessed one feature in common. Both were national Churches. Lacking a Parliament to voice his desires the Irish like the Scottish peasant found in his Church the only society which opposed an impassable barrier to the encroachments of the central government. For the Irishman obedience to his priests was a means, and the only means at his disposal, of asserting his independence against the Parliament at Westminster and the English Crown.

There was a constant stream of immigrants from Ireland to Scotland and England. Thus Irish Catholicism overflowed into Great Britain. There were several thousand Catholics in London and Liverpool. This was due to the large Irish immigration into these towns. But Great Britain possessed also its native Catholics, themselves divisible into two sections. One section consisted of the remnants of the pre-Reformation Catholic population in the Highlands of Scotland, in Lancashire and Staffordshire, which had remained faithful to the old religion through two centuries of persecution. The other section was composed of old

[1] After the expenses of the curate have been deducted, who, in addition to his board and lodging, received a horse and £10 pocket money (*Memoirs and Correspondence of Lord Castlereagh*, vol. iv. p. 99; cf. pp. 130–1).

[2] Dr. Stock, Protestant Bishop of Waterford, quoted by Wakefield, *Ireland*, vol. ii. p. 557.

families among the nobility and gentry scattered throughout all the counties of England. Each of these families, with its Catholic servants and tenants and the chaplain who formed part of the family, constituted a little island of Catholicity amid the ocean of Protestantism. The total number of Catholics, according to calculations whose accuracy is merely approximate, was about 60,000 for England, 30,000 for Scotland.[1]

To be sure a tiny minority. Nevertheless, the Catholics of Great Britain, whose leaders were the heads of noble families of the highest rank and most ancient lineage, regarded themselves and were regarded by others as occupying a position far superior to the Irish proletariat, as the flower of Catholicism in the United Kingdom.[2] Since the relaxation of the penal laws many English Catholics no longer made it a point of honour to be loyal to the faith of their fathers. Among these was the Duke of Norfolk, the friend of Fox and one of the Whig leaders. But even the large majority, who regarded conversion to Protestantism as dishonourable, were, when all is said, country gentlemen, closely akin in ideas and manners to their Protestant neighbours.[3] They were equally attached to the Throne, since there was no longer a Catholic claimant, equally attached also to the English traditions of self-government, equally opposed to every kind of bureaucracy whether in Church

[1] These figures are mere guesswork; they are based on the calculations made by the Rev. Joseph Berington in his work *The State and Behaviour of English Catholics from the Revolution to the Year* 1780, p. 111. But even for 1780 the correctness of Berington's figures is doubtful. See the contradictory figures supplied in 1773 and in 1786 by the Vicars Apostolic of London (Ward, *Dawn of the Catholic Revival*, p. 30). Between 1780 and 1818 the Irish immigration may have increased the number of Catholics in England. Later between 1830 and 1840 Manning and Gladstone estimated the number of Catholics in England and Wales as over 200,000, as possibly even 300,000 (Shane Leslie, *Henry Edward Manning, His Life and Labours*, 1921, pp. 35, 63). For the year 1840 they obtained the figure of 223,987 by multiplying by 137·5 the number of Catholic marriages. For Scotland the total of 30,000 is given by Amherst (*History of Catholic Emancipation*, vol. i. p. 279). Sinclair (*Scotland*, vol. iv. p. 9) puts the figures at 27,000, and in the very same work, vol. i. p. 21, at 50,000, possibly a printer's error for 30,000.

[2] Berington, *State and Behaviour* . . . 1780, p. 120: 8 Peers, 19 Baronets, and about 150 gentlemen of landed property.

[3] Cobbett, *Rural Rides*, October 30, 1821. "To be sure the Roman Catholic religion may, in England, be considered as a *gentleman's religion*, it being the most *ancient* in the country."

or State. What had been the organization of the Catholic Church in England under the penal laws, how was it still organized in 1815? There were no provinces or regular dioceses. Four Vicars Apostolic, appointed by Rome, administered without the normal forms of government the four districts into which England was divided. There was no parochial organization within the district, and the Vicar Apostolic had but a vague idea of the number of priests under his authority. The priests were chaplains attached to the nobility and gentry. They had been chosen by the wealthy laymen, who provided their board and lodging, not by the bishops. It was therefore but natural that these laymen came to regard themselves as the protectors of their Church, authorized by the very fashion in which English Catholicism was organized to control ecclesiastical affairs.

When at the close of the 18th century they formed a committee to obtain the abolition of the penal laws, they were with difficulty persuaded to admit a clerical minority to their deliberations. They declared themselves prepared to take an oath, formulated by themselves, which refused the Pope all temporal jurisdiction, definitely restricted his spiritual authority, and expressly condemned his claim to infallibility. They drew up an entire scheme for the reform of the ecclesiastical organization, and demanded that the Vicars Apostolic, too directly subject to the *curia* be replaced by regular bishops, whose canonical status would render their authority beyond dispute. These bishops were to be appointed by the inferior clergy, and even by the laity. Certain members of the committee laid their plans before the Duke of Norfolk. He gave them a sympathetic hearing, but added his ironical congratulations: "I applaud you for this; it is just what I ought to wish. You are following my example. You will soon become good Protestants; *I have been only thirty-five years beforehand with you.*"[1] These Cisalpine Catholics, as they termed themselves in distinction from the Ultramontanes, were the more impatient

[1] *Life and Speeches of Daniel O'Connell*, vol. i. p. 372. James Barry's *Letter to the . . . Society for the Encouragement of Arts* (1793) is a typical expression of English Cisalpinism. Barry attacks the great rulers who founded English Protestantism, Henry VIII and Elizabeth (pp. 16–17), shows how disastrous to the Papacy itself had been the claim to political power (pp. 24–5), quotes a number of Catholic authorities in favour of the principle of popular sovereignty (pp. 57–8), points out the existence of a democratic Catholicism before the Reformation, and its survival in the Swiss cantons, and expresses his hope of the establishment in France of a Gallican and democratic Catholicism (pp. 67 sqq.).

for entire emancipation in proportion to their sense of kinship in thought and feeling with their Protestant compatriots.

In fact Catholic Emancipation had already made very considerable progress. The application of the severe penal laws, which from the beginning of the 18th century had weighed heavily on the Catholics of the three kingdoms, was already lenient in the early years of the reign of George III. Informations were not lodged against those who had infringed the provisions of the penal code, and when on occasion informers forced a prosecution, the judges taxed their ingenuity to mitigate the law by decisions as favourable as possible to Catholics. From 1771 a series of Relief Acts had been passed to modify the penal laws. In Ireland an Act of 1771 permitted Catholics for the first time, on conditions defined by the Act, to hold land on a long lease. An Act of 1774 provided for Catholics a special form of the oath of allegiance. An Act of 1778 placed Catholics on an equality with Protestants as regards the ownership and leasehold of land. Two Acts of 1782 granted Catholics freedom of worship and education, and an Act of 1793 admitted them to the franchise and to commissions in the Army below the rank of colonel. In England an Act of 1778[1] provided for Catholics an oath modelled on the Irish formula of 1774, and repealed several provisions of the penal laws. Henceforward a Catholic could acquire land, by inheritance or purchase, and could open a school without incurring the penalty of imprisonment for life. No longer would the priest, the bishop, the Jesuit be at the mercy of the informer. An Act of 1791[2] completed the Act of 1778, and on the fulfilment of certain legal formalities granted Catholics, clerical and lay, freedom of worship. In 1793[3] the concessions secured by the English Catholics were extended to the Catholics of Scotland.

[1] 18 Geo. III, cap. 60.

[2] 31 Geo. III, cap. 32.

[3] 33 Geo. III, cap. 44. The oath exacted from Catholics is identical in the Irish Act of 1774, the English Acts of 1778 and 1791, and the Scottish Act of 1793. But a formula by which Catholics dissociated themselves from the cause of the Jacobite pretenders disappeared after 1791. On the other hand the formulæ in which Catholics repudiated certain doctrines of intolerance towards heretics and infidels, "commonly attributed to the Church of Rome," were modified in the Scottish oath of 1793, which mentioned heretics only, not infidels. Two later Acts of 1803 (43 Geo. III, cap. 30) and 1813 (53 Geo. III, cap. 128) were concerned only with matters of detail. Their object was to harmonize conflicting provisions of the older Acts.

Was this complete civil emancipation? No. In Scotland Catholics still lacked the right to open schools. Neither in England nor in Scotland had they the right to celebrate in public their marriages and funerals. The Catholic service was performed at the house. In church, or at the grave, a clergyman conducted the service. Was it complete political emancipation? Far from it. A Catholic could be a barrister but he could not be judge of a High Court. In Great Britain he neither possessed the franchise nor could he hold even a subordinate rank in the Army or the Navy. Nowhere in the United Kingdom had he the right to command a regiment or a vessel of the line, to occupy a post in the administration, to be elected to the Commons, to take his seat in the Lords. But after such rapid progress within the space of twenty years was not the work of emancipation on the verge of completion? Since the opening of the 19th century the question had been agitated, and had absorbed a large part of the attention of statesmen. The influence of the Catholics of the United Kingdom on the intellectual life of the nation was slight,[1] on the economic even slighter.[2] But indirectly they affected profoundly the fate of England. For the question of Catholic emancipation paralysed, and, as long as it remained unsolved, would continue to paralyse the efforts of reformers.

The Problem of Emancipation, its various Aspects.

When in the year 1800 Pitt carried through the Union of Great Britain and Ireland he hoped to make the Union popular with the Irish Catholics by granting to them and to their English and Scottish co-religionists complete political emancipation, including the right to sit in Parliament. But he was thwarted by the obstinate refusal of King George, and resigned office. In 1807 the ministry of All the Talents made another but a less radical attempt to give relief to Catholics by opening to them all ranks in the Army and Navy. But not only did George III refuse his consent to

[1] The historian Lingard, the novelist Mrs. Inchbald, the painters Barry and Mulready, the historian Charles Butler, the theologian and archæologist Joseph Milner, are the most eminent Catholic names during this period. But the two celebrated actors, Kemble and his sister Mrs. Siddons, no doubt did more to make their Church popular than all these intellectuals together.

[2] Berington, *State and Behaviour* . . . 1780, p. 121. "At this hour there are not more than two Catholics of any note who are even engaged in mercantile business."

the introduction of the Bill, he even demanded from the Cabinet a promise never to bring it forward again, and the ministry resigned. Year after year a Catholic petition was presented to Parliament asking for emancipation. In 1812 a majority of 129 in the Commons voted that the petition be taken into consideration, and in the Lords a motion in favour of the Catholics was only lost by one vote. At this moment there was a split in the Tory Party, and the Opposition seemed on the eve of taking office. It was the universal belief that as 1806 had witnessed the abolition of the slave trade, 1812 would be the year of Catholic emancipation, and the favourable motion in the Commons would be speedily followed by an Act to give it effect. But a Bill brought forward in the Commons in 1813 failed to pass the House. Continental victories had secured the position of the Cabinet, and once more Catholic emancipation was postponed. Would the postponement be a lengthy one? And what were the obstacles opposed by public opinion to a reform whose ultimate adoption seemed inevitable?

Were these obstacles of a religious character? Obviously Catholicism and Protestantism represent opposite and mutually exclusive views of Church government and Christian dogma, indeed of religion and life as a whole. And the very period when Parliament initiated a policy of tolerance for Catholics witnessed an outbreak of Protestant feeling in England. Two years after the Relief Act of 1778 the Gordon Riots broke out against Catholics, and for several days filled the streets of London with bloodshed and incendiarism. Many people accused the Methodists of having fomented the riot. Had not Wesley uttered a public protest against any amelioration of the penal laws?[1] When the Relief Act of 1791 was under discussion, the abolitionist leader, Granville Sharpe, founded a Protestant Union to oppose the Bill.[2] But we must not forget that since these events twenty-five, and thirty-five years respectively, had passed by and several causes had conspired to render English Protestants more tolerant towards their Catholic fellow countrymen.

In the first place, the apologists of Protestantism presented their religion as essentially individualist in character, and delighted to identify, if only in word, the cause of Protestantism with the cause of freedom of conscience. To justify the persecution of Catholics they were obliged to employ

[1] See the account given by Amherst, *History of Catholic Emancipation*, vol. i. pp. 145 sqq.; also Wesley, *Works*, vol. x. pp. 153 sqq.

[2] Charles Butler, *Historical Memoirs*, vol. iv. p. 411.

very subtle arguments. And secondly, the most purely Protestant among the Protestants were the Dissenters who, like the Catholics, though not to the same extent, had been victims of Anglican intolerance. In 1807 the Tories had run an election on the "No-Popery" cry, and had worked hard to detach the Dissenters from the Whigs by appealing to their anti-Catholic prejudices. But the Dissenters had been rewarded for their Tory vote, by a Tory attempt to carry an Act restricting their freedom of organization. And there was yet a third factor at work, perhaps the most influential of the three. The anti-religious philosophy of the 18th century, and the French Revolution which embodied that philosophy in action, had imparted a new aspect to the problem of toleration. The modern Babylon was no longer Rome but Paris, Anti-Christ no longer the Pope but Voltaire. Thus the antipathy felt by the English Protestant for absolute and open infidelity led him to regard with more indulgence all forms of religion and especially Catholicism. "True enough," wrote Hannah More in one of her anti-Jacobin tracts, "the French had but a poor sort of religion, but bad is better than none."[1] Among the "Saints," Henry Thornton from 1805 was a convinced advocate of emancipation, and Wilberforce, who had always been disposed to extend the fullest toleration to Catholics,[2] in 1812 and in 1813 supported their admission to Parliament.[3] In circles widely remote from these there was a movement of reaction against the eighteenth-century ideal, classical, profane, and pagan. And the reaction favoured Catholicism. In the Christian and Catholic Middle Ages men of letters discovered new sources of inspiration. Wordsworth in the *Excursion* contrasts with the hell of the modern factory the peace of the ancient cathedral,[4] admires and describes Gothic ruins,[5] and is indignant at the thought of the disorders which accompanied the Reformation, of the altars destroyed, the religious scattered. In Scott's *Waverley* all the Calvinists are ridiculous or odious; Charles Edward, the Catholic Pretender, is on the contrary idealized, and the

[1] Hannah More, *Village Politics*.

[2] See his attempt in 1797 to open the militia to Catholics (*Life*, vol. ii. pp. 222–3). "My own final judgment," he wrote in 1808 in his *Journal*, "is not made up on the Catholic question. I strongly incline to their coming into Parliament, though not to their seeing with other men's (priests') eyes" (*Life*, vol. iii. p. 362).

[3] See his letter to William Hey, February 22, 1813 (*Life*, vol. iv. pp. 95 sqq.).

[4] Book VIII.

[5] Ibid.

heroic Flora MacIvor, also a Catholic, concludes the novel with her entrance into a Benedictine convent.[1]

Wordsworth and Scott were notwithstanding Tories, and the Tories opposed Catholic emancipation. In ecclesiastical affairs their legislation was guided by the opinions of the High Church party. Why, then, did the High Church party adopt this attitude of determined hostility to Catholicism? Of the two parties which contested the government of the Church of England was it not the High Church which tended to counteract the Protestantism of the Establishment, and which insisted on precisely those aspects of the Anglican ideal which approximated to the Catholic? But if in 1815 one or two theologians,[2] Alexander Knox[3] or Daubeny, had reached this philosophic presentation of Anglicanism, they were a mere handful.[4] Three-quarters of a century after the Low Church revival the High Church was still asleep. And it would not awake from its slumber till the realization of Catholic emancipation had suddenly altered the respective strength of the two political parties, and that in turn had caused a profound revolution in the national life. Meanwhile the High Church was a party without an ideal. And a party of men in office. For the Anglican bishops a rival hierarchy of Catholic prelates was a disagreeable prospect. Essentially also a Government party. The arguments with which the High Church opposed Catholic emancipation were not theological but political.

The Catholic Church, urged the opponents of emancipation, was not a Christian sect like the others and must therefore be submitted to a special control. In virtue of a constitution at once autocratic and bureaucratic, its entire structure rested on a foundation of passive obedience to an absolute ruler, who was at the same time a foreign monarch.

[1] The *Quarterly Review*, January 1814 (vol. x. pp. 404–5) remarks that "a . . . reasonable apprehension is that to which many Protestants are not insensible, that the cause of Popery will be eventually a gainer, from the play which its system gives to religious feeling," but appears in this to be thinking chiefly of Germany. "One of the remarkable effects of mysticism has been that some of its principal supporters in the North of Germany have gone over to the Roman Catholic opinions."

[2] Typical expression of their standpoint will be found in *Thirty Years' Correspondence between Knox and Jebb*; letters from Knox to Jebb, June 13, 1811; January 5, March 8, September 13, 1813; and from Jebb to Knox, March 7, 1813.

[3] Book VIII.

[4] See for this group the copious details, too copious one is inclined to think in view of its practical insignificance, in Overton, *English Church in the 19th Century*, pp. 25 sqq.

The Catholic Church was and desired to be a State within the State. It was all very well for Catholics to declare that their obedience was due to the Pope only in spiritual matters. Between spiritual and temporal the line was difficult to draw, and Catholics left the Pope to draw it. Was it not an article of the Catholic faith that no one was bound to keep faith with heretics? That the Pope could dispense Catholics in advance from the obligation of their oaths, and absolve them for the guilt of their violation? Of what use was it to extract from Catholics the express repudiation of these tenets, when their affirmations, even when sanctioned by oath, must always be suspect? Was it prudent to abandon the penal laws which had freed England for a century from the troubles occasioned in so many Continental nations by the struggle between the Clergy and the Government? But in the course of the last fifty years these arguments had obviously lost much of their old plausibility. The memories of the *Armada*, blest by the Pope, and of the two last Stuarts, Catholics and traitors to the nation, had begun to fade into the distance. It was in vain that a sour fanatic like Dr. Duigenan, or a pedant like Sir John Cox Hippisley, insisted on the danger to national unity to be feared from the political interference of the Holy See. The House of Commons heard their harangues with a growing impatience, and they caused even more amusement than irritation. For the European situation had entirely changed.

Between 1792 and 1795 England had witnessed the arrival on her shores of the entire body of the French clergy proscribed by the Jacobins, and had taken pride in extending to them a lavish hospitality. Scarcely fifteen years after the Gordon Riots a public subscription for the exiled priests brought in £33,775. The Government, with the approval of Parliament and of public opinion, granted them a regular monthly allowance—£10 to bishops, £1 15s. to ordinary priests. The religious houses founded on the Continent in penal times, at Paris, Douai, St. Omer, and Liège for the education of Catholic children, or as seminaries for the English Catholic clergy, were transported to England with the connivance of the Government, and this monastic revival aroused only a few feeble protests in the Commons.[1]

In Scotland, the Government appointed a Catholic chaplain to a regiment of Catholic Highlanders, and even made grants to the Catholic clergy and their two seminaries. In

[1] Ward, *Dawn of the Catholic Revival*, vol. ii. pp. 1 sqq., 69 sqq., 163 sqq.; H. of C., May 22, 1800 (*Parl. Hist.*, vol. xxxv. pp. 340 sqq.).

Ireland, Parliament voted an annual grant of £8,000 to the new seminary at Maynooth for the training of the Irish priesthood.[1] When, in 1800, the Cardinal of York, the last representative of the Stuarts, was compelled to leave Rome by the French occupation, and lost his ecclesiastical revenues, the King, on Pitt's recommendation, granted him a pension of £4,000.[2] How could one speak seriously of a Catholic peril when the Catholic Church, spoiled and oppressed, was a pensioner on the charity of Protestant England? Surely such a Church deserved pity rather than hatred.

There followed in France the autocracy of Napoleon. After an attempt by the Concordat and the organic articles to subordinate the French clergy to the civil Government, Napoleon finally carried the Pope into France, with the intention of making him the instrument of his designs. Napoleon's policy supplied the English anti-Catholics with new arguments. Suppose, they urged, Pius VII died in his prison, and Napoleon secured the election to the Papacy of his uncle, Cardinal Fesch, would not this involve the total subjection of the Holy See to the Empire, and consequently open to French influence an entrance into the Kingdom through the Irish and English Catholics? To this the advocates of emancipation replied that if the Papacy submitted to such bondage the Catholic world would withdraw its obedience from a Government thus degraded, that a slavery so complete was hardly conceivable, and that even Cardinal Fesch, once Pope, would be in a position to defy the Emperor.[3]

Then came the overthrow of the French Empire, and at once all these fears became groundless. Pius VII returned to his capital under the protection of the British Army. His Secretary of State, Cardinal Consalvi, had long been the friend of English statesmen.[4] It was to the influence of Lord Castlereagh that he owed his seat at the Congress of Vienna beside the Allied sovereigns and their representatives. To secure the integrity of its territory against the ambitions of Austria the Holy See counted on the support of the British Cabinet.[5] The Pope had become the client of England.

[1] Wakefield, *Ireland*, vol. ii. pp. 446 sqq.
[2] Lord Stanhope, *Life of Pitt*, vol. ii. p. 182.
[3] *Life and Speeches of Daniel O'Connell*, vol. ii. p. 234.
[4] *Memoirs and Correspondence of Lord Castlereagh*, vol. iv. p. 224, letter from the Rev. P. Macpherson to Sir J. C. Hippisley, Rome, July 18, 1800.
[5] *Edinburgh Review*, December 1816, No. 54, Art. 2, *Catholic Question*, vol. xxvii. p. 321.

Should we conclude from these facts that the political objections to emancipation were entirely chimerical? This would be the case were our statement complete. But one objection has been left unexamined. The vast majority of Catholics in the United Kingdom were Irish. Therefore whenever the question of Catholic emancipation was raised it involved the Irish question, and for British statesmen Ireland was the subject of legitimate anxiety.

The Emancipation Question and the Irish Question.

In Ireland Pitt had sought the simultaneous settlement of the political and of the religious problem. If he deprived Ireland of her Parliament, he intended in return to grant Irish Catholics the right to sit in both Houses of the United Parliament. And he wished at the same time to establish both Irish Catholicism and Irish Presbyterianism, which was very powerful in the north-east of Ireland. The State would pay the Catholic priests and the Presbyterian ministers, and would obtain in return a control over the choice of both. In this way the priests and ministers, instead of fomenting rebellion as they had done during the previous decade, would become Government officials with an interest in the maintenance of order.

The English Government expected the Presbyterians to raise difficulties. Jealously republican, accustomed to regard their Church as a strictly independent community, they were little likely to accept Government control. With the Catholics Pitt hoped for an easier success,[1] for the laity were not accustomed to control the choice of their clergy, and the clergy accepted Pitt's scheme. Ten bishops, and among them two archbishops who had met by accident at Dublin in 1799, had drawn up, signed and transmitted to Lord Castlereagh a formal declaration to that effect.[2] The name of every nominee to a bishopric was to be submitted for the approval of the British Government before it was sent up to Rome. Every appointment of a parish priest was to be notified by the bishop with an attestation that he had taken the oath of allegiance. But when Pitt's Government failed to open to Irish Catholics the Westminster Parliament the prelates changed their attitude. They dared not brave Irish public opinion by accepting the revenues held out to

[1] *Memoirs and Correspondence of Lord Castlereagh*, vol. iv. pp. 223 sqq., Lord Castlereagh's letter to Addington, July 21, 1802.

[2] The text will be found in Wakefield, *Ireland*, vol. ii. pp. 514–15.

them at the very moment when the hopes of their lay co-religionists had been disappointed.[1] Nevertheless in spite of repeated failures the British Government continued to expect good results from the Union. It must, they thought, accustom Irish and English Catholics to common action in defence of their common interests. "It may," wrote Sir Arthur Wellesley in 1807 to Lord Hawkesbury, "have the effect of moderating their party violence; at all events it will give us an additional channel for knowing their secrets."[2] Events very quickly gave these hopes the lie.

In 1808 the secret, hitherto successfully guarded, of the negotiations between Lord Castlereagh and the ten bishops on the eve of the Union leaked out. John Milner, Vicar Apostolic of the Midland District and the London agent of the Irish bishops, admitted that the report was well founded, and that in 1799 ten Irish prelates had in fact accepted a Government veto on episcopal appointments. The supporters of Catholic emancipation, Henry Grattan and Lord Ponsonby, made haste to argue that the fears expressed by its opponents were without foundation, and that complete equality of legal rights could be granted to Catholics without imperilling national unity. But a division was immediately revealed among the Catholics of the United Kingdom.

The more wealthy Catholics, noblemen, gentlemen, and members of the middle class, landowners, barristers and merchants, were eagerly waiting for the passage of the Act which would enable them to take an active share in the political life of the nation. They had not the least objection to grant the Government in return a veto on episcopal nominations. There was nothing in such a veto that conflicted with Catholic discipline. In Canada the British Government, as the successor of France since the Seven Years' War, actually appointed the Catholic bishops.

Poor Catholics, on the other hand, had no direct interest in such legislation. They could never become officers in high command, judges or members of Parliament. And in Ireland these poor Catholics were opposed to the veto for a very good reason, not religious, but political. The veto would give the Government in London a control over the choice of the Irish clergy, and this would complete the Act of Union by a further assault upon their national freedom.

A party was formed in Ireland whose programme was

[1] H. of C., May 13, 1813, Lord Castlereagh's speech (*Parl. Deb.*, vol. xxvi. p. 155).

[2] Yonge, *Life of Lord Liverpool*, vol. i. p. 263.

opposition to the veto. Its leader, an orator whose eloquence never flagged, was the young barrister, Daniel O'Connell. O'Connell refused to divorce the cause of Catholic emancipation from the cause of Irish emancipation. If one must be sacrificed to the other, it should be the former, not the latter cause.[1] He proved himself so skilful an agitator that he intimidated the Irish hierarchy. Less than four months after the debate in Parliament, during which the secret of their concessions had been made public, the Irish bishops, gathered in a meeting convened for the purpose, declared unanimously that it was inexpedient to make any change in the canonical form hitherto followed in the appointment of Catholic bishops.[2] The Popular party, led by O'Connell, with its programme of unyielding resistance, made continual progress at the expense of the aristocratic and moderate party, led by Lord Fingall. When in June 1812 the Opposition secured the passage by the Commons of a motion in favour of Catholic emancipation, which was carried by a considerable majority, it revealed a glaring divergence between the Catholics and their supporters in Parliament. The latter had obtained their majority by accepting conditional emancipation—emancipation accompanied by a system of securities. The overwhelming majority of Irish Catholics—that is to say, the overwhelming majority of the Catholics of the United Kingdom—desired and were actually demanding at a series of extremely violent meetings the total and *unconditional* repeal of the penal laws.[3]

During the spring of 1813 a Catholic Emancipation Bill was introduced in the Commons. The original draft was the work of Grattan, but Canning added a number of articles embodying the desired securities, and Grattan accepted these articles in the belief that it was impossible to pass the Bill on any other terms.[4] What, then, were these securities?

[1] *Life and Speeches of O'Connell*, vol. i. p. 86, speech delivered on December 29, 1810: "We would fain excite a national and Irish party capable of annihilating any foreign oppressor whatsoever"; also pp. 54–5, speech on September 18,1810: "Nay, were Mr. Perceval to-morrow to offer me the Repeal of the Union upon the terms of re-enacting the entire penal code, I declare from my heart and in the presence of my God that I would most cheerfully embrace his offer."

[2] *Edinburgh Review*, November 1810, No. 33, Art. 1, *Catholic Question* (vol. xvii. pp. 1 sqq., especially 26 sqq.).

[3] Meeting of June 18, 1812 (*Life and Speeches of O'Connell*, vol. i. pp. 168 sqq.).

[4] For the text of Grattan's Bill, see H. of C., April 30, 1813 (*Parl. Deb.*, vol. xxv. pp. 1108 sqq.); and for Canning's additional

First, an oath very long and detailed and directly inspired by "Cisalpinism"; secondly, the establishment of a Board of Commissioners, to be chosen by the Crown from the leading representatives of British Catholicism, the Peers and great landlords. When Rome proposed a successor to a vacant bishopric the Board should possess the right to examine his credentials, and after such examination accord or refuse the candidate the testimonial of loyalty and peaceable behaviour, without which he could not be appointed; and all bulls and other Papal documents must be submitted to the examination of the Board, which would refuse to permit their circulation, if in the opinion of the Board they were opposed to the law of the land. Probably this scheme also was of Cisalpine inspiration. The Catholic gentry would have been delighted to introduce into the administration of the Church the principle of aristocratic self-government after the approved British pattern. Generally speaking, all, or almost all, the English Catholics accepted Canning's plan, and among them three of the four Vicars Apostolic. But Catholic Ireland was in arms. O'Connell expelled the "vetoists" from the Catholic Board, a committee that had been formed in Ireland for Catholic defence.[1] The bishops denounced the scheme as schismatic.[2] It was impossible, urged the anti-vetoists, to regulate the relations between Church and State without an agreement with the Pope, and the Pope, then the prisoner of Napoleon, was inaccessible.

But even in the Pope's absence Rome possessed an ecclesiastical authority for the transaction of current business. In February 1814 the English statesmen and the Catholic moderates obtained from Mgr. Quarantotti, the head of propaganda, an unreserved approbation of the Bill of 1813. This, however, altered nothing. The Irish intransigents refused to admit his competence, and appealed to the Sovereign Pontiff in person.[3] Indeed, they went even further, and declared that if the Pope were to ratify Quarantotti's

---

articles, H. of C., May 11, 1813 (*Parl. Deb.*, vol. xxvi. pp. 88 sqq.). For the final text of the Bill after its amendment in committee, see H. of C., May 20, 1813 (*Parl. Deb.*, vol. xxvi. pp. 270 sqq.).

[1] Catholic Meeting at Cork, August 30th (*Life and Speeches o, O'Connell*, vol. ii. pp. 7 sqq.).

[2] General Meeting of the Roman Catholic Prelates of Ireland, May 27, 1813 (*Life and Speeches of O'Connell*, vol. i. p. 320).

[3] Resolutions passed by the Bishops, May 27, 1814 (*Life and Speeches of O'Connell*, vol. ii. p. 149).

decree they would not yield. "I am sincerely a Catholic," declared O'Connell, "but I am not a *Papist*. . . . In spiritual matters, too, the authority of the Pope is limited. . . . Let our determination never to assent reach Rome."[1]

Meanwhile Pius VII returned to Rome. Anti-vetoists and vetoists dispatched rival deputations to lay their case before him. The anti-vetoists were represented by Murray, co-adjutor of the Archbishop of Dublin, and by John Milner; the vetoists by Poynter, Vicar Apostolic of the London district. Pius VII found himself in a difficult position. For all their unguarded language, the Irish Catholics were defending the right of the Catholic Church to unrestricted freedom. On the other hand, the Pope had no desire to quarrel with the British Government, nor, indeed, could he afford a breach. In April 1815 a letter from Cardinal Litta, the prefect of propaganda, attempted to hold a balance between the two parties. The oath was rejected and with it the Board of Commissioners. But a modified form of veto was suggested. From the list of candidates proposed for every vacant bishopric the Crown should have the right to demand the elimination of a certain number of names, but must always leave enough names for the Holy See to make a choice. But even this was too great a concession for Irish intransigence. O'Connell accused Milner of betraying the cause of those whom he represented in Rome;[2] and the Irish bishops, while protesting their veneration for the Sovereign Pontiff, unanimously expressed their persistent anxiety at "a determination of His Holiness adopted, not only without our concurrence, but in direct opposition to our repeated resolutions."[3]

"The English do not dislike us as Catholics; they simply hate us as Irish." In speaking thus[4] O'Connell no doubt described correctly the true character of English hostility to Catholicism. The speaker himself by his agitation did much to strengthen the anti-Irish prejudice, and his semi-religious, semi-political agitation aggravated the agrarian disorders already described. The mass of the proletariate, indeed, still lacked sufficient class-consciousness to enter into the agitation, but its inertia was daily decreasing. The Catholic Board, twice dissolved, was re-constituted in 1815 as the Catholic Association, and it was O'Connell's avowed in-

[1] January 24, 1815 (*Life and Speeches*, vol. ii. p. 178).
[2] Ward, *Eve of Catholic Emancipation*, vol. ii. p. 147.
[3] August 23, 24, 1815 (*Life and Speeches of O'Connell*, vol. ii. p. 206).
[4] May 29, 1813 (*ibid.*, vol. i. p. 344).

tention to make every parish priest the official agent of the revolutionary societies which he had organized.[1] Is it surprising that in London there was a reaction of opinion unfavourable to Catholicism?

A majority of the Commons, and possibly even of the Lords, would have admitted to Parliament a Lord Petre, an Earl of Shrewsbury, a Sir John Throckmorton and a Charles Butler; but no one cared to face the prospect of a party of demagogues—intransigent, rebellious and separatist—sitting in Westminster as representatives of the Irish counties. Those who had hesitated were strengthened in their doubts. Such was Wilberforce, whose state of mind is a faithful reflexion of the changes of public opinion. In a speech, delivered in 1814, he asks in accents of irritation whether the Irish must not be regarded as among the races unworthy of freedom.[2] The most convinced supporters of emancipation could not forgive O'Connell and his followers for having so brutally dismissed Grattan, after long years of unwearied labour on behalf of Irish independence and Catholic emancipation, merely because Grattan had not indeed proposed, but had judged it prudent to accept, the system of securities devised by Canning. "I mean," Grattan declared, "to support the Catholic question with a *desperate* fidelity."[3] It was the courage of despair. During the century now opening the Irish question was destined alternately to accelerate and to retard the movement of reform. In 1815 it retarded reform. For the moment, by universal consent, the cause of Catholic emancipation was at a low ebb; and this was the result of Irish violence.

[1] H. of C., May 17, 1814; speech of Sir John Cox Hippisley (*Parl. Deb.*, vol. xxvii. p. 931).
[2] H. of C., July 20, 1814 (*Parl. Deb.*, vol. xxvii. p. 808).
[3] H. of C., May 30, 1815 (*Parl. Deb.*, vol. xxxi. pp. 522–3).

CHAPTER II

FINE ARTS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE

THE FINE ARTS

Patronage of Artists.

DURING the opening years of the 19th century Methodism and Evangelicalism had imbued English society with their *ethos*. And it was precisely in the middle class, whose social importance was increasing with the progress of the industrial revolution, that this Protestant revival first took root. The middle class, therefore, was not only deprived by their eagerness to accumulate wealth of the leisure necessary for the appreciation of the Fine Arts, it was imbued with a spirit of positive antipathy towards the artistic. The Protestant pietist was an iconoclast who rejected as sheer paganism every attempt to idealize natural form. The conscience of the individual believer was a sanctuary where God was present to his worship. But no symbol could represent His Presence, however imperfectly, to the imagination. If a Puritan merchant deigned to accord any attention to the Fine Arts, he was actuated not by any æsthetic ideals, but by the hope that the improvement of artistic technique might indirectly improve the processes of industry. Since 1754 there had existed in London a "Society for the Encouragement of Arts," and the society was flourishing. The first exhibition of paintings had been held on its premises, and it offered annual prizes for drawing. But its full title was "Society for the Encouragement of Arts, *Manufactures and Commerce* in Great Britain," and the title reveals its founders' real object.[1] Two of three hundred youths studied

[1] Taylor, *Fine Arts in England*, vol. ii. p. 169. "They entered into subscriptions, and offered rewards for the discovery of native cobalt, and the smalt, zaffer, etc., prepared for it, and for the cultivation of madder and other substances used in the process of dyeing and in the manufacture of cottons." Cf. the inaugural address delivered by the painter West in 1792, on his election to the Presidency of the Royal Academy: "Here ingenious youth are instructed in the Art of design; and the instruction required

the Fine Arts in London. How many of these would become in the strict sense of the term painters or sculptors? Five or six was the estimate of the *Edinburgh Review*. "The rest," continued the *Review*, "spread themselves through our various manufactures, of porcelain, pottery, foundery, cotton-printing, etc., and give them that elegance of design and beauty of finish, which, added to our superiority in capital and machinery, secures to them the command of the markets throughout the world."[1] Thus did the manufacturer make the artist his tool. Apart from this service to himself he disdained the artist's life as useless, idle and sensual. The entire energy of the English capitalist was directed to the improvement of the tools and methods of manufacture and to the better organization of industry, and apart from these ends of immediate utility, to purposes more general indeed, but still utilitarian, philanthropy and political reform. If he rested every seventh day it was to pray, not to enjoy life.

If these were the new interests of the middle class, interests inimical to artistic culture, were any counteracting influences at work in England? The Court perhaps? When George III ascended the throne he was the first of his dynasty to manifest a desire to give the monarchy its legitimate place among the national institutions. And the revival of monarchy had reacted on the Fine Arts. British artists were divided into rival coteries. The King decided to take one of these groups under his protection and to establish it as the "Royal Academy of Arts in London, for the purpose of cultivating and improving the Arts of Painting, Sculpture and Architecture."[2] The Royal Academy consisted of forty members, a proof of the royal purpose to imitate the French monarch and the French Académie des Beaux Arts. Its membership

---

in this place has spread itself through the various manufactures of this country, to which it has given a taste that is able to convert the most common and simple materials into rare and valuable articles of commerce. These articles the British merchant sends forth into all the quarters of the world, where they stand pre-eminent over the productions of other nations (Galt, *Life of West*, vol. ii. p. 747). Cf. the programme of the British Institution (see below p. 493): "To improve and extend our manufactures by that degree of taste and elegance of design which are to be exclusively derived from the cultivation of the Fine Arts and thereby to increase the general prosperity and resources of the empire."

[1] *Edinburgh Review*, September 1814, No. 46, Art. 1; Northcote's *Life of Reynolds* (vol. xxiii. p. 269).

[2] See Sandby, *History of the Royal Academy*, vol. i. pp. 45 sqq.

was recruited by cooptation. Its government was a president assisted by a council of eight. The members elected a secretary and an archivist. The King nominated a treasurer. Nine "visitors," historical painters, eminent sculptors or other qualified artists, arranged classes of drawing from models, four professors taught anatomy, architecture, painting and perspective, and these nine visitors and four professors were elected by the Academy and removable by the King. Reynolds had been the first president. Indeed, the accession of George III marks the transition from the period of Hogarth to the period of Reynolds.

Hogarth had been a popular artist, hostile to the aristocracy. He had preferred to depend for his livelihood on the sale of his engravings than to enter the clientele of a nobleman. The foe of corporations, he had prevented the British painters founding an Academy during his lifetime. Reynolds, on the contrary, was a man of the world and a born Academician. He was the first artist to receive a title since the accession of the House of Hanover. He was a fashionable portrait painter, also a painter of large mythological and historical groups; he decorated churches and palaces. His inaugural speech at the Academy is an excellent statement of his aims. After paying his homage to the "influence of Majesty," against which the Whigs were opening their campaign, he preached to the students "an implicit obedience to the *rules of art*, as established on the practice of the great masters . . . perfect and infallible guides," and expressed the hope that the new institution "may answer the expectation of its Royal Founder, . . . that the present age may vie in arts with that of Leo X and that the dignity of dying art . . . may be revived under the reign of George III." Reynolds died in 1792.[1] West and Lawrence divided the succession. West became President of the Royal Academy, Lawrence the Court painter. Never before had British art enjoyed a period of equal brilliance, and the Academy could claim the credit without fear of contradiction. The King subjected the Academy to a rigorous control, and in 1806 for political reasons he refused to appoint Smirke archivist.[2] The social position of an artist was immediately raised by the fact of his inclusion in the official hierarchy. The Academy gave an annual dinner to which 140 guests were invited, at which all the distinguished members of Government circles were entertained on a footing of equality by

[1] Quoted by Sandby, *History of the Royal Academy*, vol. i. pp. 45 sqq.

[2] *Life of Haydon*, vol. i. pp. 24–5.

painters, sculptors and architects who possessed the diploma. The artist, therefore, was now treated as a gentleman, not as formerly, as an artisan. On ceremonial occasions the Academician took precedence of a "master of arts." Himself and his eldest son had a right to the title of esquire.[1] Though since Reynolds no artists had received a baronetcy, two architects, Chambers and Soane, the engraver Strange, and the painter Lawrence had been knighted. When the President of the Academy, West, refused a knighthood, he justified his refusal by his religious scruples as a Quaker; but popular report found the true reason in a pride which disdained a distinction not hereditary.[2] The painter Opie who died in 1808 was buried, like Reynolds, in Westminster Abbey.

A social barrier had fallen. Artists had been admitted to the ruling class, and apparently by the action of the monarch. We must not, however, overlook the limitations which confined royal influence in this direction. King George attempted conscientiously to play the part of patron of the arts. Unhappily, he lacked the vocation. He was a countryman, devoted to farming and hunting, and his interests were bounded by the domestic circle. Artists had more to hope from his son the Prince of Wales, who spent lavishly and loved luxury and pleasure. But since his advent to power as Regent all his actions were subject to the jealous scrutiny of Parliament. His private means were not inexhaustible and he was not free to regulate his own expenditure. The entire weight of commerce and industry in the House of Commons opposed the addition of useless expenses to the crushing burden of the war debt. To the great Whig families the Regent was the object of implacable hatred, a liar and a traitor. And the gentry viewed with suspicion everything that might increase unduly the prestige of the Crown.

The true rulers of the country were the nobility and gentry. And it was they who, by commissioning portraits at high prices, gave art its direction. If the Royal Academy had succeeded, the measure of its success had been determined by the extent of their patronage. And in fact the novel institution had been the object of lively opposition and had not been suffered to enjoy an uncontested supremacy. It was accused of servility to the Government. Barry and Haydon conducted campaigns whose echoes spread far and

[1] *Minutes of Evidence before Select Committee on Arts and Principles of Design*, 1836, pp. 794 sqq.

[2] Sandby, *History of the Royal Academy*, vol. i. p. 296.

wide against a body they judged inimical to the unfettered development of genius. Though the hostile groups which had preceded the foundation of the Royal Academy, the "Society of Artists," and "the free Society of Artists" were extinct by the end of the 18th century, other groups had been formed independent of the Academy, though not directly competing with it.[1] Until 1798 the choice of an artist to design a public monument had been left to the official society. But the favouritism displayed by the Academicians, their tendency to manipulate unfairly open competitions, and to monopolize commissions, provoked lively complaint. In 1798 the House of Commons appointed a "Committee of Taste" composed of amateurs, taken in part from the Members of Parliament, to which these nominations were henceforth transferred.[2] And when about the beginning of the new century public opinion was convinced that the Government did not yet afford sufficient encouragement to art, no appeal was addressed to the Royal Academy, no new official society was demanded. A number of noblemen with the assistance of a few wealthy bankers founded by subscription a free society. The "British Institution for the development of the Fine Arts" founded in 1805 awarded prizes, possessed a permanent picture gallery and opposed to the Academy exhibition its annual or rather its half-yearly exhibitions.[3] To be sure the Institution disclaimed any systematic opposition to the spirit of the official society. Nevertheless, the circumstances of its foundation and the success it achieved are symptomatic

[1] *Society of Painters in Water Colours*, 1805; *The Associated Artists in Water Colours, Society of Engravers, under the Patronage of H.R.H. the Prince of Wales*, 1803.

[2] Prince Hoare, *Epochs of the Arts*, 1813, pp. 229–33. The commission was universally known as the "Committee of Taste"; but its official title was "Commission for the Erection of Public Monuments." An additional committee was subsequently appointed to choose the site of monuments in cathedrals. On this committee six members of the Royal Academy were added to the members of the Committee of Taste (*ibid.*, pp. 258–9). Cf. Barry, *A Letter to the Dilettanti Society*, 1797.

[3] Taylor, *Fine Arts in England*, pp. 214 sqq.; Galt, *Life of West*, vol. ii. pp. 179 sqq. The first exhibition of the *British Institution* was identical in character with the exhibition of the Royal Academy. The second was of a more special character and henceforward the plan of the exhibition differed from year to year. In 1813 there was an exhibition of Reynolds; in 1814 of Hogarth, Wilson, Gainsborough, and Zaffany; in 1815 of the Flemish and Dutch masters; in 1816 of the Italian and Spanish.

of the national temper. In England the power of the monarch was swamped by the influence of the aristocracy.

Music, Architecture, Sculpture, Painting.

Royal patronage, noble patronage: these were the influences which in England supplied the lack of patronage by a middle class too hard worked and too puritanic to encourage art, and which stimulated artistic progress. But we must not be too dogmatic in our statements. It is not easy to establish between the Fine Arts and other social phenomena relations sufficiently simple for the convenience of the historian. Natural endowment is a necessary, if not a sufficient condition of artistic achievement, and the causes of its existence or non-existence lie outside the sphere of history. How, for example, can we explain by the influence of pietism the worthlessness of British music? No doubt the English eighteenth-century Puritan proscribed every branch of art, even music, and refused to admit hymns into his worship. Nevertheless, of all the arts music must have suffered the least from this proscription. What, then, was the reason that in spite of the Puritans eighteenth-century England possessed dramatists and painters but lacked musicians? Moreover, in this respect, as in so many others, the new puritanism, the puritanism of Wesley, marked a transition. Far from excluding hymnody the Methodists made hymn-singing a distinctive feature of Evangelical worship. Both Charles Wesley and John Wesley himself were the authors of hymns which became classics, and they stimulated an entire literary movement which would culminate in 1833 in the publication of Edward Bickersteth's *Christian Psalmody* whose circulation reached 150,000 copies.[1] And if the Church of England at first discouraged hymn-singing as tainted by its Methodist associations she encouraged instrumental music as a reaction against hymnody and as a counter attraction. Towards the close of the 18th century Burney introduced professional singers into Anglican churches.[2] A few years later Sydney Smith remarks the growing employment of music to attract congregations, and notices the erection of a large number of organs in churches throughout the provinces.[3] This rivalry should have effected a revival of sacred music. That this

[1] Overton, *Evangelical Movement*, pp. 124 sqq.; *English Church*, pp. 132 sqq.

[2] Overton, *English Church*, pp. 133–4.

[3] Lady Holland, *Memoir of the Rev. S. Smith*, 1855, vol. i. p. 49.

was not the case was surely no fault of the prevailing pietism. Must we not rather conclude a racial incapacity?

To turn from music to architecture. Here the operation of the environment is easier to discern. The enormous towns now springing up on all sides were of a uniform ugliness, an ugliness which occasioned no discomfort to the capitalists who built them. Four brick walls pierced by windows, soon black with grime, served according to the arrangement of the interior as house, factory or church. These buildings which boasted no style of architecture whatsoever were dumped down at haphazard. Thus as street was added to street villages grew into towns, towns into cities. No Government department intervened in the process, national, provincial, or municipal. There was no general plan, no expression of the will of the community. "In future times," wrote Lady Holland in 1800, "when this little island shall have fallen into its natural insignificancy, by being no longer possessed of a fictitious power founded upon commerce, distant colonies, and other artificial sources of wealth, how puzzled will the curious antiquary be when seeking amidst the ruins of London vestiges of its past grandeur." She explains the meanness of everything throughout England "by the spirit of 'independence' and 'selfishness'" engendered by a commercial civilization. "Hence there is no ambition, no desire of perpetuating by great works fame to posterity."[1] The brothers Adam, who were architects, remarked how the "bigoted zeal" and the "superstitious pomp" of Roman Catholicism had favoured the artistic achievement of Italy. "Neither," they continued, "has the form of our Government nor the decent simplicity of our religion, ever demanded any such exertion; nor is it probable that they ever will while we continue a free and flourishing people."[2] The Tory spirit, once more awake in England since the accession of George III, reacted against this extreme of religious and commercial individualism; but the results of this reaction were disappointing. We have seen how ineffective, on the whole, the Tory revival had proved. Take ecclesiastical architecture. The Tories erected no churches. They abandoned the field to the Nonconformists, who multiplied their hideous meeting-houses. Take civil architecture. The Government was thwarted by the jealousy and parsimony of the Commons. When Carlton House was connected with the northern suburbs by the opening

[1] *Journal*, vol. ii. p. 54.

[2] *The Works in Architecture of Robert and James Adam*, vol. i., 1778, Preface to Part IV.

of Regent Street, an imposing thoroughfare elaborately designed, protests were raised which had not yet ceased.[1] Moreover, this Georgian architecture bore the stamp of its origin. It was academic and artificial.

"The buildings of the Ancients," wrote Robert Adam, "are in architecture what the works of Nature are with respect to the other Arts; they serve as models which we should imitate, and as standards by which we ought to judge."[2] The principle here enunciated moulded ever more tyrannically the taste of British architects. Sir William Chambers' Somerset House, built at the end of the 18th century, was no doubt a work of the classic style in which free invention was combined with imitation. But as time passed the Græco-Roman models were copied with an ever-increasing servility. For a century past the "Dilettanti Society"[3] had dispatched missions to Italy, Greece and Asia Minor. Dawkins and Wood published their *Bualbek*, Adam his *Spalatro*, Stuart his *Athens*. All these archæological treatises served as guides to the English architects. The middle class in the industrial centres followed suit. Whenever they required a town hall, an exchange, a bank, they planted haphazard amid the chaos of narrow streets a sham temple turned out to order by an Academician. At the Bank of England business men passed beneath the Arch of Constantine to receive their money in the Roman temple of the Sun and Moon.

It is more surprising that British architects were unable to create an original style of domestic architecture adapted to the requirements of the fine, spacious and free existence spent on their country seats by the nobility and gentry. Over two hundred mansions had been built in the course of the 18th century. In 1815 the movement had not slackened. But the artistic worth of all these country houses, the seats of the aristocracy, was very slight. Can it be that the eighteenth-century Englishman, aristocrat and bourgeois alike, was an individualist who disdained to display his wealth to the curiosity of the passer-by, and reserved for the interior of his home ingenious arrangement and luxurious furniture? Was not the most distinctive feature of English domestic architecture precisely the central hall, invisible from without, an adaptation of the Mediterranean Patio to a cold and rainy

[1] H. of C., February 15, 1816 (*Parl. Deb.*, vol. xxxii. pp. 576–7).
[2] R. Adams, *Ruins of the Palace . . . at Spalatro*, Preface.
[3] For the circumstances of its foundation, its aristocratic composition, and its activities, see Taylor, *Fine Arts in England*, vol. ii. pp. 158 sqq.

climate.[1] The suggestion would be plausible had the exterior of the mansion been unpretentious. Unfortunately, the owners followed the advice of the professional architect whose ideal was the vast size and classical style of Latin antiquity. But since the remains of ancient architecture were the ruins of public buildings architects set themselves the problem of building houses which should be as habitable as possible while resembling not the private houses of the ancients, for which evidence was wanting,[2] but Roman or Greek temples.

A few owners rebelled and demanded a style more national, less artificial. But exchanging one form of archæology for another they sought their models in the mediæval architecture of England.[3] Fifty years earlier Horace Walpole had initiated the Gothic revival by building a sham abbey at Strawberry Hill. In 1815 Beckford was engaged upon his sham abbey at Fonthill, a ridiculous piece of scene painting hastily put together which had already fallen once and was destined to a second fall.[4] An entire school of antiquarians furnished architects with the necessary models. John Britton published in 1807 the first volume of his *Architectural Antiquities of Great Britain*; Sir James Hall in 1813 his *Essay on the Origin, History and Principles of Gothic Architecture*. And Catholics began to exploit, for apologetic purposes, the nascent enthusiasm for the art of the Middle Ages. John Milner, Vicar Apostolic of the Midland District, urged the fundamental Catholicism of the Gothic style in a work which attracted considerable attention.[5] But in reality the Gothic fashion was as insincere

[1] Fergusson, *History of the Modern Styles of Architecture*, 3 Ed., vol. ii. p. 91.

[2] It was precisely to fill this lacuna that R. Adam had undertaken his study of Diocletian's Dalmatian Palace, *Ruins of the Palace at Spalatro*, Introduction, p. 3. John Hall, *Origin . . . of Gothic Architecture*, pp. 135 sqq., remarks with justice that the classical style is inapplicable even to a Christian church without alterations which change its character completely.

[3] Eastlake, *History of the Gothic Revival*, pp. 57–8, remarks that restorations in the original style of country houses and castles had never ceased entirely.

[4] Fergusson, *History of the Modern Styles of Architecture*, vol. ii. pp. 96 sqq.

[5] Is this the reason that Eastlake in his *History of the Gothic Revival* makes no mention of Milner? See his protest (p. 59) against "the vulgar superstition which then and long afterwards identified the Pointed Arch with the tenets of Rome." For Milner's work, see *Quarterly Review*, October 1811, Art. 111, *Milner's Ecclesiastical Architecture* (vol. vi. pp. 62 sqq.).

as the neo-classical. There were not even two rival schools inspired by opposite convictions. The selfsame architects, clever men of business, men like Wilkins and Nash, worked in either style indifferently, and produced to suit the whim of their client, a Doric portico, or a decorated façade, at need even a Chinese pagoda.

In sculpture and painting the efforts of the Royal Academy to create a grand style achieved a measure of success. Thomas Banks had founded for the first time in English history a national school of sculpture. Flaxman who enjoyed a European reputation, Chantrey, Westmacott, Wyatt, were artists of considerable merit. In Benjamin West England possessed a successful historical painter. Fifty years before our date West had effected an artistic revolution by depicting the men and women who figured in his pictures in the exact costume of their period and profession. Though now seventy years of age he continued to produce, and the subjects which he undertook were increasingly ambitions.[1] It was said that between 1769 and 1801 he had received £34,787 for pictures commissioned by the King. In 1811 the British Institution bought for 3,000 guineas his picture of "Christ Healing the Sick" and gave it to the nation.[2] But the current code of morality restricted the patronage of King and Government. Artists were faced by the prudery of the Court. We are told that King George refused to sit to Gainsborough to mark his disapproval of the artist's personal immorality, and that the latter was therefore compelled to study the monarch unobserved and paint him from memory.[3] They were faced by Puritan bigotry. When in 1773 the painters of the Academy offered to decorate the interior of St. Paul's at their own expense the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London refused the offer as calculated to arouse the cry of Popery.[4] And they were faced by the parsimony of the

[1] See Prince Hoare's appreciation of West in 1813, *Epochs of Art*, p. 221: "Above the sportive, desultory trains of Venetian grouping, he ranks with the more chaste composers of the Florentine and Lombard schools; and surpassing many, is excelled by few."

[2] Taylor, *Fine Arts in England*, p. 224; Carey, *Observations . . . on . . . Decline of . . . Historical Painting*, p. 64. According to Carey's estimate, subscriptions, the sale of an engraving of the picture, and the receipts of the exhibition brought the British Institution about £13,000.

[3] *Memoirs and Correspondence of Viscount Combermere*, vol. i. p. 333.

[4] Sandby, *History of the Royal Academy*, vol. i. pp. 145–8; Pye, *Patronage of British Art*, pp. 217–18. Pye, however, remarks

Exchequer. It was in vain that the Royal Academy made repeated attempts to obtain a grant of £5,000 to open a Gallery of Honour which should contain a permanent exhibition of the best examples of contemporary painting.[1] Parliament voted the erection of two monuments to celebrate the victories of Trafalgar and Waterloo.[2] But the Waterloo memorial was never carried out. Such was the strength in the Commons of the spirit of opposition, so pettifogging was the meanness of the middle class, so intense the indifference of the gentry to the embellishment of the capital. The aristocracy, whose patronage exercised a decisive influence on the development of the fine arts, demanded portraiture. Economic reasons, therefore, explain the uninterrupted victory of the portrait painters in the struggle which they had waged for the past fifty years with the historical painters.[3] It was by his portraits that Reynolds had accumulated a fortune of £100,000.[4] A portrait by Lawrence cost in 1815 300 guineas and would shortly cost 700.[5] It was in vain that the Royal Academy had been founded for the purpose of enabling a British artist to paint, without starvation, subjects other than portraits; in vain that the British Institution excluded portraits from its annual exhibition. Despite every effort to the contrary the English school remained a school of portraiture. Gainsborough had died in 1788, Reynolds in 1792, Romney in 1802, Hoppner, the favourite painter of the Prince of Wales, in 1810, and the Scottish artist Raeburn had but a few more years to live. But Lawrence was in full possession of his faultless technique. The Regent had entrusted to Lawrence the decoration of a State apartment at Windsor Castle to commemorate the

---

that the prejudice had already grown weaker, as was shown by the decoration of churches at Rochester, Winchester, and Salisbury, also of St. Stephen's, Walbrook and St. Margaret's, Westminster. Prince Hoare, *Epochs of the Arts*, p. 259, adds the chapel of the Foundling Hospital. See the protests of contemporary painters against this Puritanism, also Barry, *Inquiry*, chap. v. (*Works*, vol. ii. p. 210); Carey, *Observations . . . on . . . Decline of . . . Historical Painting*, p. 13. Cf. *Literary Works of Sir Joshua Reynolds*, vol. ii. p. 338.

[1] *Minutes of Evidence for Select Committee on Arts and Principles of Design*, 1836, p. 1106.

[2] H. of C., February 5, 1816 (*Parl. Deb.*, vol. xxxii. pp. 311 sqq.).

[3] For this bitter contest see Barry, *Inquiry*, chap. x. (*Works*, vol. ii. pp. 246 sqq.); *Life of Haydon*, vol. i. *passim.*

[4] *Biographie Universelle*, art. Reynolds.

[5] *Journal of a Tour . . . by a French Traveller*, 1815, vol. i. p. 39.

victories of 1814 and 1815. Not, however, with battle scenes. In obedience to public taste and the force of circumstances the Regent commissioned a gallery of portraits. So Lawrence renewed the days of Rubens and Van Dyck, and went abroad to execute the royal command by obtaining sittings from all the sovereigns of Europe. It was the supreme moment of English portraiture.

Webster tells us how he abandoned architecture in 1803 because he had not found in that profession the pecuniary advantages he had at first expected. He therefore determined to become a landscape painter, since landscape painting was at that time a highly "lucrative profession."[1] At the beginning of the century the landscape painters constituted with the portrait painters the glory of English art. They had slowly emancipated themselves from the foreign influences under which they had grown up. Dutch influence is evident in Gainsborough, and in Crome, the founder of the Norwich school; French and classical influence can be seen in Wilson and is obvious in the pictures of Turner's first manner. Nevertheless, these masters possess an original quality common to them all. Before Turners' art had reached its perfection, or Constable had made his reputation, they constituted already a school in the strictest sense of the term.[2] They created a new tradition the offspring of a land of mist and cloudy skies. For they discovered the beauty of an atmosphere which possessed a life of its own and in which every object was bathed. This type of art of a supreme chastity and permeated by a vague mysticism awoke less than any other the hostility of the Evangelicals. And an aristocracy of country dwellers appreciated this effort to maintain the love of nature, more vigorous and unimpaired

[1] Bence Jones, *History of the Royal Institution*, p. 194.

[2] In 1815 Turner exhibited a classical painting, "Dido building Carthage." See the eulogy in the *Examiner*, May 28, 1815: "Gaspar and Nicholas Poussin may have painted nobler grown trees, and have been more careful in detail and finishing; Rubens may have had even a bolder flush of colour, and Claude more refinement; but combining all Mr. Turner's other capabilities with that best of all qualities, a creative imagination, not one of the great Masters was more significant and inspiring than the Professor of Perspective to the Academy." In all Turner exhibited eight pictures, which included besides the Dido "The Eruption of the Souffrier Mountians" and "Crossing the Brook." The *Examiner* contained the following criticism of Constable's exhibition: "It is a pity that Mr. Constable's pencil is still so coarsely sketchy. There is much sparkling insight and a general character of truth in 268, 'Village in Suffolk,' and in 245, 'Boat Building.'"

than in any other country in Europe, at a time when in England beyond any other European country industrialism and its urban type of civilization were making such gigantic strides. And it is, no doubt, to the same influence that we should ascribe the vogue enjoyed by the genre painting, a little picture depicting a scene of everyday life, especially of country life. Morland was dead, but Wilkie was the fashion and Mulready was winning his first successes. In the Academy exhibition of 1815 they were represented by two of their most celebrated pictures, Wilkie's "Distraining for Rent," Mulready's "Idle Boys."

Possibly the development in England of landscape painting, genre painting, and above all of portraiture had disappointed the hopes of those who had founded the Royal Academy to encourage the grand style in art, and historical painting in particular. For even in the Academy the historical painters were outnumbered by the portrait painters, landscape painters and genre painters. Engravers on the other hand were excluded. By the constitution of the Academy they were allowed six seats among the associates, who lacked the vote and were even excluded from the library. Landseer wasted his energy in fruitless efforts to obtain better treatment for himself and his fellows. He demanded the election of four engravers and the addition to the annual exhibition of a room of engravings. His attempts failed, and the indignant engravers refused their candidature for the six seats among the associates which had been alloted to them.[1] Academicians persisted in their contempt for engraving, as an art altogether subordinate, a mere technical process, serviceable for the dissemination of works of art, in fact, a craft not a fine art. Such obstinacy is amazing, and all the more amazing, when we consider that for the past thirty years England had produced the best engravers in Europe.

The entire English school of engraving owed its existence to Alderman Boydell, a good artist and a successful man of business. He had commissioned from the best painters a series of pictures whose subjects were taken from the plays of Shakespeare. The pictures were to serve as models to Woollett, Earlom and Sharpe, and to form a permanent exhibition of modern painting, the celebrated *Shakespeare Gallery* in Pall Mall.[2] And the growth in England of the trade in engravings had profoundly affected the economic

[1] Sandby, *History of the Royal Academy*, vol. i. pp. 134–6, 273–4; *Minutes of Evidence before Select Committee on Arts and Principles of Design*, 1836, pp. 1308, 1226–1328.

[2] Sandby, *History of the Royal Academy*, vol. i. p. 165.

situation of the English artist. Henceforth he depended not as formerly on royal or noble patronage but on the anonymous patronage of the public who purchased on a large scale the engravings of his work.[1] The engraving could either be sold singly or incorporated in a book. It might be the portrait of a celebrity, or the illustration of a novel or book of travels.[2] In any case painter and engraver became producers whose productions were retained by the publisher. Thus engraving considered as a trade occupies a position intermediate between painting and literary production.

DRAMA AND LITERATURE

Patronage of men of letters.

The Government extended its patronage not to artists alone, but also to men of letters. England possessed her poet laureate, who for a salary of £100 per annum held himself in readiness to celebrate in verse victories by land or sea, and the birth, marriage or death of members of the Royal Family. The State also awarded pensions, offices and sinecures to men of letters. Southey, poet laureate since 1813, received beside his official emoluments a pension of £145. At the age of twenty-seven the poet Campbell was granted a pension of £200. The influence of Lord Moira secured for Thomas Moore the post of Registrar of the Bermudas. He resided in England while a substitute performed his official duties in Bermuda. In 1820 the Regent will appoint the dramatist George Colman, lieutenant of the Yeomen of the Guard, and remit the purchase money. Authors often owed Government favours to noble influence. But the heads of noble families, landed gentlemen, bankers, even manufacturers, were sometimes their immediate patrons. Coleridge was on the verge of entering the Unitarian ministry to obtain a livelihood when the Wedgwoods came to his assistance; and they paid later the entire expense of his tour in Germany. Wordsworth, Southey and Thomas Moore all accepted the assistance of a wealthy patron. Even the new philanthropic movement applied its energy in this direction. A group of important landowners and merchants formed in 1790 an association, known as the Literary Fund, to assist indigent authors. The fund gave an annual dinner

[1] Pye, *Patronage of British Art*, p. 141.

[2] For the early days of book illustration in England see Pye, *Patronage of British Art*, pp. 246–7.

at which the members exchanged compliments and the authors thanked their benefactors in verse.[1] "Poetry, as *the wise* know," wrote one of his correspondents in 1808 to Constable, the publisher, "requires judgment, genius and *patronage*."[2]

But at the very time when this letter was written the patronage of literature whether official or private was passing out of fashion.

Noble patronage was condemned by public opinion with an ever-increasing severity. In a novel, whose object was to attack patronage of every description, Miss Edgeworth introduces the drawing-room bard, the tame author, and portrays him as a miserable creature, a figure of fun.[3] Writers who consented to accept the patronage of the Literary Fund were the object of universal derision.[4] The laureateship had long since lost its ancient prestige, and was finally discredited when in 1790 Pitt gave it to an unknown poetaster named Pye as payment for political services. At Pye's death in 1813 the Regent offered the laureateship to Scott. But he refused and secured Southey's appointment in his place. It was not only that Southey was the older man and extremely poor. Scott shrank from the ridicule which attached to the title. "I should be mortified," wrote the Duke of Buccleugh, "to see you hold a situation which by the general concurrence of the world is stamped ridiculous."[5] There were those who desired the State to do for writers what it had done for painters, sculptors and architects and found an institution similar to the French Academy.[6] But the scheme proved abortive. And though 1823 would witness the foundation of a Royal Society of Literature, it degenerated into a mere "Académie des Inscriptions." When Canning was asked to patronize the scheme, he refused. "I am really of opinion," he replied, "with Dr. Johnson that the multifarious personage called The Public is, after all, the best patron of

[1] For the Society for the Establishment of a Literary Fund, the circumstances of its foundation, its composition, statutes and resources, see Lettsome, *Hints Designed to Promote Beneficence, Temperance, and Medical Science*, vol. ii. pp. 237 sqq.

[2] A. Murray to A. Constable, April 6, 1808 (*Archibald Constable*, vol. i. p. 263).

[3] *Patronage*, chap. xxii.

[4] Byron, *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers*, vol. i.–ii. with the note; *Quarterly Review*, September 1812, Art. 6, *D'Israeli's Calamities of Authors* (vol. viii. pp. 122–3; the article is Southey's).

[5] Lockhart, *Memoirs of the Life of Sir Walter Scott*, vol. iii. p. 79.

[6] See *Quarterly Review*, September 1812, Southey's article above-mentioned.

literature and learned men."[1] No longer was the Court or even the nobility arbiter of the world of letters. The managers of theatres and the publishers, middlemen between the author and his public, had succeeded to their position as rulers of the literary world.

Drama.

English drama made neither reputations nor fortunes. Since Otway tragedy was dead. Home's *Douglas*, already half a century old, and far more recently Joanna Baillie's tragedies of character, were artificial and unsuccessful attempts. Gloomy and mediæval dramas were, indeed, manufactured by the score, and Maturin's *Bertram* had scored in 1815 a striking success. But nobody regarded these new productions, even if successful, as destined to become classics. During the early years of George III, in the days of Sheridan and Goldsmith, comedy had shone with the parting brilliance of sunset. But Sheridan was no more, and years before his death the politician had killed the dramatist. Though Charles Dibdin, George Colman junior, and Prince Hoare were still writing light comedy, which was facile and amusing the decadence was none the less rapid and incontestable. Theatre managers had supplied the deficiencies of the national drama by adaptations of French pieces, ancient or modern. Remarking the unpopularity of French literature since 1792 they turned to Germany for a new source of dramatic supply, and for the past twenty years the Londoner had wept over the tragedies of Kotzebue.[2] English drama was on the brink of the grave.

By a remarkable paradox England, destitute of great dramatists, was rich in great actors. In default of modern drama they drew Shakespeare from oblivion, and thereby won their own laurels. Garrick had initiated the revival. But Garrick presented a Shakespeare adapted to eighteenth-century taste. When in 1783 Kemble made his first appearance at Drury Lane as Hamlet, he announced his intention to play the tragedy as originally written by Shakespeare.[3] And he wore the costume of the period in which the action was imagined to take place. Assisted by the painter, William Capon, and influenced by the Gothic revival Kemble effected a revolution in stagecraft.[4] And so thorough was the con-

[1] Smiles, *Murray*, vol i. p. 237.
[2] Boaden, *Life of Mrs. Jordan*, vol. ii. pp. 34, 43–5.
[3] Boaden, *Memoirs of . . . Kemble*, vol. i. p. 88.
[4] *Ibid.*, vol. ii. pp. 160–1.

version of the public that the reform which he had initiated was soon felt to be inadequate. In spite of his promises he still presented an adapted Shakespeare, and Leigh Hunt, after witnessing what he termed a "farcical representation" of the *Tempest*, swore that never again would he watch Shakespeare acted.[1] Even Kemble's acting seemed cold and mannered[2] since, in the January of 1814, Kean had revealed his powers in the part of Shylock and a few months later as Richard III. Kean's acting was violent, exaggerated and brutal, and he pushed realism to affectation. "Our styles of acting," Kemble told a friend, "are so totally different, that you must not expect me to *like* that of Mr. Kean; but one thing I must say in his favour—he is at all times terribly in *earnest*."[3] But the Shakespearian revival ushered no revival of British drama. As Shakespeare was more frequently acted and better interpreted, the exhaustion of dramatic genius in England was more painfully evident.

To what cause must the decay of the drama be attributed? Many observers ascribed it to the legal regulations which controlled the stage in England. A stature of 1737 had not only subjected all plays to the preliminary censorship of the Lord Chamberlain, but had imposed severe restrictions on the number of theatres.[4] Henceforward neither the Crown by letters patent nor the Lord Chamberlain by licence could authorize dramatic representations outside the City of Westminster and places of royal residence. The erection of a theatre in any English town would require a special Act of Parliament. Certainly a larger measure of freedom had been bestowed by a statute of 1788 which invested the magistrates at Quarter Sessions with authority to grant licenses.[5] But even this measure of liberty was seriously restricted.

[1] *Examiner*, July 23, 1815: "Even those daubs of pictures, formerly exhibited under the title of the Shakespeare Gallery, had a less evident tendency to disturb and distort all the previous notions we had imbibed in reading Shakespeare. . . . And be it observed further, that these same anomalous, unmeaning, vulgar and ridiculous additions, are all that *take* in the present farcical representations of the *Tempest*."

[2] *Examiner*, February 5, 1815.

[3] Boaden, *Memoirs of . . . Kemble*, vol. ii. p. 555.

[4] 10 Geo. II, cap 28. See also Geo. II, cap. 36.

[5] 28 Geo. III, cap. 30. See the preamble: "Whereas it may be expedient to permit and suffer, in towns of considerable resort, theatrical representations for a limited time and under regulations; in which, nevertheless. it would be highly impolitick, inexpedient and unreasonable to permit the establishment of a constant and regular theatre."

The magistrates were empowered to authorize theatrical representations "for a limited time," they could not license "a constant and regular" theatre. Nor had they power to grant licenses within a radius of twenty miles of Westminster, London and Edinburgh, fourteen miles of Oxford and Cambridge, ten miles of a royal residence, eight miles of a theatre already licensed by letters patent. And if the provincial theatre secured new facilities by the legislation of 1788, the system of monopoly obtaining in London was unaffected by the Act. Whereas under Elizabeth London with a population of 230,000 possessed seventeen theatres, and Paris in 1815 with a population of 548,000 possessed twenty-three, contemporary London with its population of a million possessed no more than a dozen. Of these twelve theatres only two, in virtue of letters patent granted by Charles II, enjoyed an unrestricted liberty. One of these was Covent Garden, burnt in 1809 and re-erected on a magnificent scale by Robert Smirke with a façade in the classical style copied from the Parthenon. The other was Drury Lane, burnt a few months after the destruction of Covent Garden, and rebuilt in the same style by Benjamin Wyatt. The little theatre at the Haymarket and the Lyceum were only licensed for the summer months and their repertoire was restricted to light comedy. And these four were the only theatres in the strict sense of the term to be found in London.

Thirty years previously Palmer had attempted to open a new theatre in the East End in the neighbourhood of the Tower. But the management of Covent Garden and Drury Lane protested, and Palmer's Royal Theatre was condemned to be one of the second-rate theatres, theatres such as the Amphitheatre at Westminster Bridge, the Circus at St. George's Fields, Sadler's Wells at Islington,[1] where pantomimes and farces were acted and circus performances given. The managers of the large theatres were clever politicians who utilized aristocratic patronage and interested influential Members of Parliament in their undertakings. Whitbread, the leader of the Popular party in the Commons, had become towards the close of his life a member of the managing committee of Drury Lane. In this way, whenever the authorization of a new theatre was brought before Parliament, the monopoly secured zealous advocates, even among the most active members of the Liberal Opposition.[2] We might

[1] Charles Dibdin, *History and Illustrations of the London Theatres*, p. 87.

[2] James Lawrence, *Dramatic Emancipation*, 1813, in the *Pamphleteer*, vol. ii. pp. 385–6. H. of C., April 28, 1813, Whitbread's

be tempted to ascribe the paralysis of drama to these legal restrictions.

The day, however, would come when the Act of 1788 would be repealed and the theatre released from its bondage; and the decadence of British drama would not be arrested. We are therefore compelled to seek its cause elsewhere, possibly in the growth of Puritanism. Eighteenth-century actors had remarked that a provincial audience was more strait-laced than a London audience, and that many pieces could be staged in London whose production would be impossible elsewhere. By degrees the severity of the provinces spread to the capital. A middle-class audience drawn from the social *milieu* most profoundly affected by Evangelical beliefs would no longer tolerate the witticisms at the expense of Methodists and Quakers which were the traditional eighteenth-century method of extracting a laugh from the theatregoer. If Leigh Hunt in his articles of dramatic criticism was never weary of praising the *Beggar's Opera*, his motive was the desire to check the growing unpopularity of Gay's masterpiece. Modern cant found this rogues' comedy vulgar and demanded cuts.[1] "We are drilled," he complained, "into a sort of stupid decorum, and forced to wear the same dull uniform of outward appearance."[2] The nobility and gentry of the provinces had little opportunity to patronize the drama, and the private theatricals which were the fashion during the closing years of the 18th century could not supply the want of theatres. And in the large towns the Puritan bourgeoisie neither went to the theatre themselves nor desired the local authorities to patronize the stage. They were too busy, too serious; and they did not approve of pleasure.

The stage about 1815 occupied a very curious position.

---

speech; H. of L., June 27, 1814, Lord Holland's speech (*Parl. Deb.*, vol. xxv. pp. 1096 sqq.; vol. xxviii. pp. 418–19).

[1] *Examiner*, June 18, 1815, November 5, 1815. Miss Laetitia Hawkins, *Anecdotes*, vol. i. 1822, pp. 99–100, judges the piece exactly as Leigh Hunt accused the public of judging it. "That vulgar caricature," she calls it. The *Eclectic Review*, an Evangelical organ, denounced in January 1807 the grossness of Shakespeare (Doran, *English Stage*, vol. iii. p. 331). Wilberforce was invited by his friends in 1811 to consider the advisability of founding a moral theatre: "Sir Thomas Bernard's plan of an Alfred Theatre by private subscription—no promiscuous admission—select plays and actors—all *pour la morale*." Wilberforce, however, expressed distrust of the proposal, which was not sufficiently strict for his approval (*Life*, vol. iii. p. 497).

[2] *Examiner*, August 20, 1815.

The growth of Puritanism had not resulted in the degradation of the comedian to the legal status of "vagabond" out of which the 18th century had raised him.[1] Garrick and Kemble were prominent members of the middle class, who moved in good society, and were universally respected.[2] In London comedians dined with the Regent at Carlton House.[3] On tour they received invitations from the gentry.[4] Nor was social propriety outraged when an actress made a brilliant match. The rigid code of the middle class would never be able to gain a complete triumph over the habits acquired by the upper classes during the previous century. Nevertheless the theatre was being increasingly abandoned to the common people.

In 1815 a traveller remarks that it was not the fashion in London to spend the evening at the theatre.[5] Except for a row of boxes, the very arrangement of the theatre sacrificed the comfort of the wealthy playgoer, whether fashionable or bourgeois. He was squeezed on the narrow benches of the pit, for the French orchestra stall was still unknown. Above the boxes the gallery occupied a very important position. There, facing the stage, sat *the Gods*, otherwise the populace, and interrupted the representation with its jokes, applauding, booing, throwing orange-peel. To the right and left were free entrances for the light women of the neighbourhood; for the management had devised this method of attracting the men.[6] Nowhere in Europe were the theatres more rowdy. When in 1809 the management of Covent Garden had attempted to raise the price of seats, the O.P. (Old Prices) demonstrations[7] had stopped all

[1] 10 Geo. II, Cap. 28, had repeated, so far as comedians were concerned, 12 Anne, St. 2, Cap. 23.

[2] Laetitia Hawkins, *Anecdotes*, vol. i., 1882, pp. 21 sqq. For Mrs. Siddons, see Madame D'Arblay, *Diary and Letters*, ed. 1854, vol. ii, pp. 164–5.

[3] Doran, *English Stage*, vol. iii. p. 346.

[4] Dibdin, *Reminiscences*, vol. i. pp. 174–5, 205, 206–7; vol. ii. pp. 278–9.

[5] *Journal of a Tour . . . by a French Traveller*, 1815, vol. i. pp. 89 sqq. Cf. Leigh Hunt, *Autobiography*, p. 134.

[6] James Lawrence, *Dramatic Emancipation in Pamphleteer*, vol. ii. pp. 384–5. *Report of Select Committee on Dramatic Literature*, 1832, p. 27: "I think it is a most decided objection to any man carrying his wife or sister to the theatre, when he is compelled to take them through a crowd of women of notoriously bad character."

[7] Dibdin, *History of the London Theatre*, pp. 19 sqq. According to Boaden the riot was not without a political aspect (*Memoirs of Kemble*, vol. ii. p. 500 sqq.). Cf. Boaden, *Memoirs of Mrs. Siddons*, vol. ii. pp. 369–70.

performances for two months. There had been a riot at the Opera in 1813,[1] riots at Drury Lane and Covent Garden in 1815.[2] A popular audience demands a popular performance. Therefore while the polite and polished drama, the comedy of manners and the comedy of character, were declining and on the verge of extinction, the harlequinade flourished. Kemble and Kean were content to "revive" Shakespeare, but Grimaldi created an original type, the English clown. Nevertheless a middle class, careful for the respectability of the nation, supervised the amusements of the populace. If the English clown was brutal, he was not obscene.

Publishers and Authors.

If the theatre was at a standstill, the publishing trade was making enormous strides. The development dated from the 18th century. The first important publishing houses in England had been founded by Jacob Tonson and Bernard Lintot shortly after the Revolution of 1688. The London firm of Longmans dates from 1724. During the early years of George III's reign, Elliot of Edinburgh earned the jealousy of the entire trade by his daring ventures and by the high prices he paid to authors. The standing of Miller of Albemarle Street won him the soubriquet of "Lord Albemarle." Joseph Johnson, the publisher of Liberal Nonconformity, gave dinners attended by Price, Priestley, Fuseli the painter, Gilbert Wakefield, and Mary Wollstonecraft. But it was only within the last twenty years that the touch of the industrial revolution had transformed the venerable guild of publishers, the Stationers' Company.[3]

Formerly competition between publishers was practically non-existent. Books were often published co-operatively by several members of the company or by the company as a whole.[4] Moreover, every publisher was at the same time a retail bookseller, and business between publishers was a process of barter, each publisher exchanging a portion of his own stock for a corresponding quantity of books published by the other houses. But the publisher was now a publisher first and foremost, his retail trade an unimportant extra,

[1] *Examiner*, May 16, 1813.
[2] *Ibid.*, July 23, 1815.
[3] For the changes effected, see Smiles, *Murray*, vol. ii. p. 508.
[4] F. Espinasse, *Histories of Publishing Houses* (*Critic*, April 7, 1860, new series, vol. xx. p. 435).

his concession to the established tradition, though also continued because his shop served as a *salon* where authors, critics and men of literary taste could meet, discover the public demand and acquire a personal influence over the world of letters.[1] He now refused country orders, and purchase had replaced barter in business relations between publishers. Once a year he held a *Trade Sale*. All the book-sellers, both those of Paternoster Row and the Edinburgh booksellers, were invited to a dinner at a hotel. After dinner the stock of which the publisher wished to dispose was sold by auction. This arrangement enabled a publisher to sell his stocks quickly, and at the same time the custom of trade dinners was introduced into the book trade.

On the eve of the trade sale publishing houses had no ready money. Their effects had accumulated in the publisher's safe, and their commitments were on so large a scale that the debts of a single firm might exceed £40,000.[2] A financial crisis selected the solid firms by extinguishing the imprudent. The new system of industry and commerce was marked by the supremacy of a few energetic leaders compelled at every instant to employ all their resourcefulness in the defence of their sovereignty. The book trade, equally with the iron or the cotton trade, possessed its "kings" in 1815. Constable reigned in Edinburgh, Murray in London. Constable exploited Sir Walter Scott, Murray Byron. Constable shared with Jeffrey the editorship of the *Edinburgh Review*, the famous critical review whose foundation marked an era in the history of English literature and which was the organ of advanced Liberalism. Murray was editor of the *Quarterly Review*, founded to oppose the *Edinburgh*. Its director was Gifford, its inspiration Canning. Murray, heir to a firm already solidly established, and better educated than his rival, professed all the tenets—ethical, religious and political —of the respectable Conservative. Unlike Murray, Constable, a man of the people, displayed the manners of a parvenu. Overweening, despotic and daring he pursued his road to

[1] David Constable to his Father, November 2, 1813: "It invites literary men to come about you, which I think one of the greatest pleasures of the bookselling profession, and appears to me to make the distinction between the person who is merely a *wholesale dealer*, and him who makes it his profession as well for the advancement of learning as for his emolument" (*Archibald Constable*, vol. ii. p. 114).

[2] Rob. Cathcart to A. Constable, May 2, 1812 (*Archibald Constable*).

bankruptcy. Constable was the "Napoleon" of publishing,[1] Murray "the Prince" of booksellers.[2]

It is astonishing at first sight to remark no apparent decrease in the price of books. New books were very expensive, more expensive indeed than at the commencement of the reign.[3] A short poem by Byron, for instance the *Bride of Abydos* or the *Corsair* was priced at 6s. 6d. a new novel in two or three octavo volumes between 12s. and 18s. But these figures do not represent the true cost of books. Hookham and Lane had already founded large circulating libraries, in which a single copy served the needs of a great number of readers.[4] And since the publishers were no longer interested in the retail trade and sold their stocks below the published price, booksellers were free to sell below the nominal price. James Lackington had inaugurated the system in 1790,[5] and his example had been followed throughout the entire trade. Again, if first editions were expensive, reprints of popular works were soon issued at a lower figure. A publisher named Harrison had begun in 1779 the system of publication by instalments, in weekly parts of two octavo columns, and priced at 6d.[6] His *Novelists' Magazine* had been followed by the *New Novelists' Magazine*, by the *British Classics* and the *Sacred Classics*. When Hume's *History of England* went out of copyright, two popular editions in parts were published by rival houses, and both were successful. In 1815 the leading publishers were still opposed to this method. Publication in parts, the "number trade" seemed to them unworthy of their reputation; and they were afraid that a cheap reprint of a successful work would reduce their unsold copies to waste paper or check the circulation of the first edition.

[1] "The grand Napoleon of the realms of print" (Lockhart, *Life of Sir Walter Scott*, vol. vii. p. 351).

[2] Washington Irving, *Sketch Book*, Preface.

[3] Knight, *Shadows of the Old Booksellers*, Appendix, pp. 263 sqq. The *Market of Literature* records during the first forty years of the reign an increase of price ranging between 50 per cent. and 100 per cent.: "The 2s. 6d. duodecimo had become 4s., the 6s. octavo 10s. 6d., and the 12s. quarto £1 1s."; and during the following period (1800–27) a further increase in price: "The 4s. duodecimo of the former period became 6s., or was converted into a small octavo at 10s. 6d.; the 10s. 6d. octave became 12s. or 14s., and the guinea quarto very commonly £2 2s."

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 25–6.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 254. Hitherto booksellers had destroyed a portion of the stock purchased by auction at the Trade Sale and had sold the remainder at the published price.

[6] Rees and Britton, *Reminiscenses of Literary London*, pp. 21 sqq.

But they would be obliged to adopt the new methods at no distant date. Within a few years Constable, and Murray in imitation of Constable, would be selling quite recent novels in a single 6s. volume and would thus multiply tenfold the number of readers.[1]

How large was the public reached by the publishers of London and Edinburgh? It is difficult to arrive at an exact estimate. The combined circulation of the *Edinburgh* and the *Quarterly* extended to 20,000 copies.[2] These 20,000 purchasers, who represented perhaps 100,000 readers, constituted the élite of the British public. It was calculated that Longmans spent £300,000 on the publication of *Chambers's Cyclopædia*, revised by Rees. And the enterprise was a success. This implies an enormous number of purchasers.[3] The increase in the number of publications affords another measure of the increase in the number of readers. 327 was the average yearly output during the last decade of the 18th century, 588 during the first twenty-five years of the 19th century.[4] But the most reliable proof of the prosperity of the book trade is afforded by the large profits which authors were beginning to make. The merchants and manufacturers of the new school were essentially optimists who speculated on an unlimited extension of their markets. The book trade was no exception. Constable, Murray and their fellows displayed their optimism by their liberal treatment of authors. It was the etiquette with publishers not to keep too exact

[1] *Archibald Constable*, vol. iii. p. 359.

[2] *Memoirs, Journal and Correspondence of Thomas Moore*, vol. ii. p. 40, Jeffrey to Thomas Moore, September 14, 1814: "It is something to think that at least 50,000 people will read what you write in less than a month. We print now nearly 13,000 copies." Smiles, *Murray*, vol. i. p. 366, John Murray to Lord Byron, September 12, 1816: "My *Review* is improving in sale beyond my most sanguine expectations. I now sell nearly 9,000. Even Perry says the *Edinburgh Review* is going to the devil." *Ibid.*, p. 372, to the same, January 22, 1817: "I now this time print 10,000 of my *Review*." *Ibid.*, vol. i. p. 204, Southey to Bedford (1817): ". . . Murray . . . prints 10,000 and fifty times ten thousand read its contents, in the East and in the West." *Ibid.*, vol. ii. p. 4, John Murray to James Hogg, January 24, 1818: ". . . the *Quarterly Review*, of which, by the way, the number printed is now equal to that of the *Edinburgh Review*, 12,000, and which I expect to make 14,000 after two numbers"

[3] Rees and Britton, *Reminiscences of Literary London*, p. 53.

[4] Knight, *Shadows of the Old Booksellers*, p. 275. New publications between 1800–27, 19,860; if we deduct a fifth for reprints we obtain a yearly average of 588. New publications 1792–1802, 4,096; deducting a fifth as before, a yearly average of 327.

an account, to pay more than the stipulated sum, if the success of a work had exceeded the publishers' expectations,[1] to make up totals to a round sum, and occasionally to pay guineas where the agreement was for pounds.[2] Constable made presents to Scott, and furnished Abbotsford.[3] "In your connections with literary men," wrote the publisher Blackwood to Murray, "you have the happiness of making it" (the publishing trade) "a liberal profession, and not a mere business of the pence."[4] Publishers, now the real patrons of English literature, made the fortunes of authors.

For serious works dealing with religion, philosophy, science and travel an author might receive up to £1,000, even £1,500. In 1812 Constable paid Dugald Stewart £1,000 for a preface on *The Progress of Philosophy* to introduce the *Supplement of the Encyclopædia Britannica*, and an equal sum to Playfair for a sketch of *The Progress of Mathematics and Physics*.[5] Fashionable novelists received for a novel £1,500, £2,000, even £3,000.[6] Poets fared as well as novelists and their emoluments increased every year. In 1805 Scott received from Longmans £500 for the copyright of the *Lay of the Last Minstrel*[7] and in 1807 for *Marmion* 1,000 guineas payable in advance. "It was a price," he said later with a laugh, "that made men's hair stand on end."[8] In 1814 he received 1,500 guineas for half the copyright of *Lord of the Isles*, the other half remaining his property.[9] Byron in 1812 received £600 for the first two cantos of *Childe Harold*, 1,000 guineas in 1813 for the *Giaour* and *Bride of Abydos*, £2,000 in 1816 for the third canto of *Childe Harold*.[10] In 1814 Thomas Moore was looking for a publisher to buy a poem. Longmans agreed to pay 3,000 guineas, but asked to see the poem. Murray agreed to dispense with the inspection of the verses, but offered only £2,000. Moore finally agreed with Longmans to take £3,000 for a poem still unwritten, the poem to be at least equal in length to Scott's *Rokeby*.[11] And the second-rate poets benefited by the rise in prices.

[1] Smiles, *Murray*, vol. ii. pp. 129–30.
[2] *Archibald Constable*, vol. iii. p. 165.
[3] *Ibid.*, vol. iii. p. 228.
[4] Smiles, *Murray*, vol. i. p. 456.
[5] *Archibald Constable*, vol. ii. pp. 318, 322.
[6] *Ibid.*, vol. ii. p. 70.
[7] Lockhart, *Life of Sir Walter Scott*, vol. ii. p. 196.
[8] *Ibid.*, vol. iii. p. 4; Smiles, *Murray*, vol. i. p. 76.
[9] Lockhart, *Life of Sir Walter Scott*, vol. iv. p. 345.
[10] Smiles, *Murray*, vol. i. pp. 211, 221, 367.
[11] *Memoirs, Journal and Correspondence of Thomas Moore*, vol. ii. pp. 57, 58.

When Crabbe in 1818 offered Murray his *Tales from the Hall*, Murray offered to purchase the copyright of his entire works for £3,000. Authors had now become so exacting that Crabbe at first refused and sought, in vain, better terms from another publisher.[1]

The authors, thus released from penury and Bohemia, adapted themselves in different ways to the novel conditions. When Crabbe received his £3,000 he was as delighted as a happy child, and hurried off with his banknotes to Trowbridge to show them to his son.[2] Byron remembered that he was a Lord, affected to despise payment, refused to negotiate directly with his publisher and abandoned the money he had earned to poor friends.[3] The aged Southey, whose character was methodical and industrious, turned out epics and reviews with the diligence and regularity of a conscientious workman.[4] Scott was a daring speculator, who got on all the better with Constable because he regarded authorship as Constable regarded publishing.

Scott wrote to get rich, to purchase an estate, to become a great landlord. He began by putting his money into a printing and publishing business in order to receive from his works a double profit, the publisher's as well as the author's. The business was doing badly when Constable bought it. Henceforward the great publisher and the great author worked in partnership. Constable paid Scott fixed sums in promissory notes in return for an undertaking to deliver a poem or a novel by a fixed date. If the undertaking was

[1] Smiles, *Murray*, vol. ii. p. 72; *Memoirs, Journal and Correspondence of Thomas Moore*, vol. ii. pp. 235–8. The great reviews were still important sources of income to authors. When Constable founded the *Edinburgh* he made the experiment of paying his contributors highly, at the rate of ten guineas a page, three times the rate paid by the older reviews, and fifty guineas a number to the editor. The rate per page rose later to twenty guineas. (Cockburn, *Life of Jeffrey*, vol. i. p. 134; vol. ii. p. 74). The *Quarterly* paid the same rates. See Southey's letter to Coleridge: "The most profitable line of composition is reviewing. . . . I have not yet received so much for the *History of the Brazils*" (in three volumes) "as for a single article in the *Quarterly*" (Smiles, *Murray*, vol. ii. p. 39).

[2] *Memoirs, Journal and Correspondence of Thomas Moore*, vol. ii. p. 259.

[3] *Works of Lord Byron: Letters and Journals*, ed. Prothero, vol. iii. pp. 41 sqq. Smiles, *Murray*, vol. i. pp. 354–6.

[4] "Literature is now Southey's trade; he is a manufacturer, and his study is his workshop." H. C. Robinson, quoted by Smiles (*Murray*, vol. ii. pp. 39–40).

not fulfilled, and the novel was not delivered by the promised date, Scott redeemed his promise by undertaking to deliver an additional novel by a later date. "They talk," he wrote, "of a farmer making two blades of grass grow where one grew before, but you, my good friend, have made a dozen volumes, where probably but one would have existed."[1] There remained the possibility of Scott's death in the interval. Constable had taken the precaution of insuring Scott's life. But perhaps Scott might have outwritten his welcome. Constable experienced occasional qualms on that score. A fellow publisher warned him that "Bank of England notes fall in value by an over-issue."[2] When this happened, instead of the publisher jogging the author, the author pushed the publisher forward: "I am wholly against any *hiatus* in these works," Scott told his friend Mr. Cadell. "I have five or six subjects in my head. . . . Some other person may enter into the arena, and give me a heavy oar to work to make up to him again. . . . I am now young and healthy and strong; some two or three years hence it is hard to say how I may be."[3] Thus in turn did these two men of business spur each other along the road to ruin.

The Novel.

Writers had become well-to-do members of the middle class. No longer were they retainers of king or noble. Their sole patrons now were their readers, for whose consumption they produced in concert with the publisher such literary wares as they deemed most saleable. But the public demanded novels. Author and publisher fed the demand with a supply almost excessive. More novels appeared during the opening years of the 19th century than in the period of Fielding and Richardson, of Smollett and Sterne. But the type of novel now in demand was no longer the type popular in the 18th century. Therefore a different type of novel was now written.

Horace Walpole had inaugurated a literary revolution by the publication of his *Castle of Otranto* in 1764. It was a stupid novel, whose literary merit did not surpass the architectural worth of its author's Gothic pile at Strawberry Hill. Nevertheless, its success calls for explanation. Walpole, a sceptic and a *dilettante*, had a sense for the demand of the moment. He perceived that the time was ripe for a double

[1] March 23, 1823, *Archibald Constable*, vol. iii. p. 207.
[2] June 12, 1823, *Ibid.*, vol. iii. p. 267 n.
[3] Cadell to Constable, February 5, 1823 (*Ibid.*, vol. iii. pp. 238–9).

reaction, against the realism of the English novel, and against the classical manner of the French. By this first attempt he fixed the romantic scenery of the imaginative novel, the mediæval castle with a ruined wing untenanted or abandoned to the family ghost. He distributed the casts —the ill-used wife, the cruel husband, his immured victim, the boastful and cowardly retainer. He had thus drawn up the recipe whose application would for a good half-century enable novelists of the "school of terror" to frighten readers out of their wits with no chance of failure and with the expenditure of a minimum of energy. Miss Clara Reeve was the first to follow in Walpole's traces with her *Old English Baron*, "a Gothic history." Further causes supervened to assist the progress of the new school. The French Revolution placed an abyss between the literature of England and France. Meanwhile German literature was coming to birth, a literature of sentiment, romance and unbridled fancy. To put the imagination to school in Germany and to compose Gothic romances was to collaborate with the anti-Gallican and anti-Jacobin movement. Mrs. Radcliffe published her celebrated novels, the masterpieces of the school, her *Sicilian Romance*, *Forest Romance*, *Mysteries of Udolpho* and *Italian*. In his *Monk*, Lewis combined terror with impropriety. Mrs. Roche's *Children of the Abbey* enjoyed a success almost equal to the success of the *Mysteries of Udolpho*. "During my confinement," wrote Lady Holland in 1800, "I have been reading (among other things) multitudes of novels, most of them sad trash, abounding with the general taste for spectres, hobgoblins, castles, etc."[1]

Nevertheless the modern rationalism set limits to this renaissance of fancy. In the manifesto with which he prefaced the *Castle of Otranto* Horace Walpole did not pose as the uncompromising foe of realism. He claims for his novel a position intermediate between the novel of the old style, where "all was imagination or improbability," and the modern novel, "where nature is always intended to be copied . . . and the resources of fancy have been dammed up by a strict adherence to common life." While he would leave his imagination free "to expatiate through the boundless realms of invention," he would make his characters act according to the rules of probability, "as it might be supposed mere men and women would do in extraordinary positions."[2] And

[1] *Journal of Lady Holland*, January 12, 1800 (vol. ii. p. 41).

[2] Preface to the 2nd edition. Cf. Preface to the 1st edition, pp. 7–8: "If this *air of the miraculous* is excused, the reader will

it was also due to his realism, his desire to keep close to nature, that he attempted to combine in his novel comedy and tragedy, "clowning and sublimity"; in this the disciple of a greater model than Voltaire, Shakespeare himself. And Mrs. Radcliffe never really quits the sphere of real life. For she is careful to reassure the reader at the end of the story, not only by an exact adjustment of fortune to merit, but by a natural explanation of all the happenings which in the course of the tale had appeared preternatural.

The last representative of the school of terror was the Irish writer Maturin. But in the preface to his *Pour et Contre*, which appeared in 1818, Maturin admits the very indifferent success of his earlier novels, *The Wild Irish Boy*, *Montorio* and *The Milesian Chief*, and ascribes it to their lack of "reality and of probability," because the characters, situations and language had been drawn solely from his imagination.[1] The new novel he now offered to the public was devoid of striking incidents and was a copy of everyday life. Even during the last years of the 18th century, when the school of terror was at the summit of its popularity, the style had been an artificial product. In 1815 it was on the decline. Indeed, the British public had never been condemned to an exclusive diet of Gothic romance. The realist novel[2] had survived Fielding and Smollett. But its character had been modified. It had lost its old brutality, its crude masculinity. Indeed, it could scarcely have been otherwise. For the novel was now the monopoly of women. Robert Bage, whose political novels had been popular towards the end of the last century, had just died. Henry Mackenzie, the author of the *Man of Feeling*, and William Godwin, the author of *Caleb Williams*, were ghosts of their former selves. The sole exception, Maturin, does not invalidate the general rule.

---

find nothing else unworthy of his perusal. Allow the possibility of the facts, and all the actors comport themselves as persons would do in their situation. There is no bombast, no similes, flowers, digressions or unnecessary descriptions. . . . The characters are well drawn, and still better maintained." And Miss Clara Reeve in the *Old English Baron* confines within even narrower limits that element of the marvellous, whose recipe she had learnt from Walpole (W. Scott, *Lives of the Novelists*, vol. ii. p. 174).

[1] Quoted in the *Edinburgh Review*, June 1818, No. 59, Art. 9, *Women, or Pour et Contre* (vol. xxx. p. 235).

[2] English writers termed a story of the imaginative type a romance, a story of the realist type a novel. See the definitions in Clara Reeve, *Progress of Romance*, pp. 6, 7, 111.

In the opening years of the century library shelves were laden with the works of women. The fact measures the emancipation of the Englishwoman. But it was an emancipation whose character is difficult to define.

Legislation shows scarcely a trace of it. The political emancipation of woman was obviously non-existent and remote from actualities. Mary Wollstonecraft's *Defence of the Rights of Woman* had awoken a very feeble response from public opinion. Even her personal emancipation was merely beginning. Though by a clever use of trustees wealthy women had secured "in equity" the protection of their marriage portion against the exploitation of their husbands, "according to the common law" the wife had no right to her personal fortune.[1] She had not even the refuge of divorce, a privilege reserved to the very rich; for every divorce required a special Act of Parliament. It was not to law but to custom that the Englishwoman owed a degree of personal freedom unknown apparently in any Continental country. For example, in England the love match was the rule, and normally at least, a girl was allowed the choice of her husband. It was otherwise in France and Germany. Nevertheless, the Englishwoman did not take advantage of her greater degree of personal liberty to claim the right to think, live or write as her male contemporaries thought, lived and wrote. On the contrary, in the pride of her stricter morality, she sought to impose on the male sex that modesty of conduct and language which the world exacted from a respectable woman, or a girl who had been well brought up. This was undoubtedly a result of the Evangelical propaganda. Feminine virtue was portrayed in its most aggressive form in the novels of Christian propaganda written by Hannah More and Mrs. Sherwood. Elsewhere the same influence was at work, though in a more indirect and attenuated form. Passing over the names of Mrs. Inchbald, Mrs. Opie, Miss Owenson and Miss Mary Brunton, we come to the greatest women novelists of the period—Miss Burney, Miss Edgeworth and Miss Austen. While Mrs. Radcliffe doted, these three women maintained the realist tradition. But all three were ignorant of the brutal and unclean aspects of life, and confined themselves to a minutely detailed study of the world open to the observation of a girl of good education and quick understanding.

The subject of Miss Burney's novels is always the same. A young girl, in consequence of unforeseen misfortunes,

[1] For the jurisprudence on these points, see Professor A. V. Dicey's interesting remarks, *Law and Opinion in England*, pp. 369–73.

finds herself plunged suddenly into the difficulties of life, and the novel is the account of her difficulties. Tragedy is by no means wanting; but the interest of Miss Burney's work lies in her accurate description of the thousand and one incidents of everyday life—her picture of a ball, of an evening at Vauxhall, of a middle-class London family living beyond their means, of a noble family bullied by a pompous and stupid father. Miss Burney's novels are akin to the genre painting and the caricature. And her tone was scrupulously moral. Miss Burney deserved her position as lady-in-waiting at the rigid and prudish Court of Windsor. "She has as much virtue of mind," said her father's old friend, Samuel Johnson, when as an enthusiastic admirer of the young novelist he introduced her to his friends, "as knowledge of the world," and "with all her skill in human nature," is at the same time "as pure a little creature."[1]

With Miss Edgeworth the novelist was a schoolmistress. Her avowed purpose was to illustrate for the imagination the moral precepts taught in the educational works of herself and her father. Her *Moral Tales* and her *Popular Tales* displayed in action the *Practical Education*, her *Tales of Fashionable Life*, the *Essays on Professional Education.*[2] Miss Edgeworth's morality had nothing of the supernatural. Whether preaching or story-telling, her feet were firmly planted on the earth. Occasionally she was content to tell a story for its own sake. The sole object of her Irish stories is to describe for the English reader the picturesque disorder and innate generosity characteristic of her countrymen. The remarks of the critics enable us to understand the qualities which the public appreciated in works which passed for masterpieces. "The quintessence of common sense," declared the *Edinburgh Review*.[3] "Miss Edgeworth," observed the *Quarterly*, "is, if we may be allowed to coin a word, an anti-sentimental novelist."[4]

With Miss Austen this feminine realism attains its perfection. While the 18th century lasted she sought a publisher in vain. The 19th century brought her a publisher and an audience. *Sense and Sensibility* appeared in 1811, *Pride and Prejudice* in 1813, *Mansfield Park* in 1814, *Emma* in 1815.

[1] Madame D'Arblay, *Diary and Letters*, vol. ii. p. 4.

[2] See R. L. Edgeworth's preface to the *Tales of Fashionable Life*, 1809, p. 4.

[3] *Edinburgh Review*, February 1815, No. 48, Art. 3, *Standard Novels and Romances* (vol. xxiv. p. 334).

[4] *Quarterly Review*, January 1814, Art. 1, *Miss Edgeworth's Patronage* (vol. x. p. 305).

The petty jealousies and hatreds, the littleness and the meanness which characterized social relations in the country and the provincial town, were portrayed by Jane Austen with a merciless, if unembittered pencil. "Have for the first time," wrote Gifford to Murray, "looked into *Pride and Prejudice*, and it is really a very pretty thing. No dark passages; no secret chambers; no wind-howlings in long galleries; no drops of blood upon a rusty dagger—things that should now be left to ladies' maids and sentimental washerwomen."[1] And in a review he welcomes the appearance "within the last fifteen or twenty years" of a type of novel which, "instead of the splendid scenes of an imaginary world," is "a correct and striking representation of that which is daily taking place."[2]

The novel of Fielding and Smollett was the novel of the old Whig England—insubordinate, riotous, licentious. The novel of Mrs. Radcliffe was the novel of Tory England—counter-revolutionary, Francophobe, chivalrous, romantic. The novel of Miss Burney, Miss Edgeworth and Miss Austen was the novel of the new England, the England of middle-class respectability and virtuous common sense, the child of Evangelicalism and industrialism.

Suddenly in 1814 the world of letters was startled by a new novel. Nothing presaged its appearance, and for years to come its author would be anonymous. It related the adventures of a young man named *Waverley*, a colourless and indecisive figure who during the last Jacobite rising in the middle of the 18th century was tossed to and fro between the Whigs and Tories, carried in succession from England to Scotland, from the Lowlands to the Highlands. The public were entertained by its descriptions of a barbarous and heroic society, its episodes of love and war. The author persevered, and *Waverley* opened the long series of "historical novels" by Walter Scott.

Were the Waverley novels the resurrection under a new form of the romance discredited by the extravagancies of Mrs. Radcliffe and her followers? Undoubtedly the psychological appeal was the same. But Scott revived the romance by making the romance realistic. He himself informs us that his object in *Waverley* was to do for Scotland what Miss Edgeworth had done for Ireland,[3] to utilize the romance to describe the manners of a past state of society, and relate

[1] Gifford to Murray, 1815 (Smiles, *Murray*, vol. i. p. 282).

[2] *Quarterly Review*, October 1815, Art. 9, *Emma* (vol. xiv. pp. 192–3).

[3] General Preface to the *Waverley Novels*, 1829.

as truthfully as possible the history of a period and country.[1] It is usual to contrast the novel of Scott with the novel of Balzac. But in reality the contrast has been exaggerated. Not only is there plenty of romanticism in Balzac; there is also plenty of realism in Scott. In many respects Balzac is essentially Scott's successor and disciple, who merely transposes Scott's procedure by applying to contemporary society the methods of the historical novel which Scott had applied to the past. Scott indeed lacks Balzac's depth and genius. The psychology of his heroes is adapted exactly to the intelligence of the schoolroom, and it was, in fact, among children of fifteen that the novels found faithful readers for an entire century. These boys and girls were delighted with the idea of learning history while reading novels. Scott addressed an audience eager at once for extraordinary adventures and the acquisition of knowledge.

Poetry.

The literary revolution which had given birth to the school of terror, to the romance, exercised on English poetry an influence of the same order, but more decisive and more profound. The imagination of the poets broke the bonds imposed by French classicism, invented freer rhythms and sought new themes in the Christian chivalry of the Middle Ages. The German origin of the Romantic movement is indubitable. Scott began his poetical career by translating German ballads. Then Coleridge, by the publication of *Christabel*, proved that English as well as German poets could draw on the sources of national legend. Then Scott set himself to edit the old Scottish ballads, and finally composed original poetry in the irregular metre which Coleridge had employed in *Christabel*, and published in rapid succession the *Lay of the Last Minstrel*, the *Lady of the Lake*, and *Marmion*. These were short romances filled with adventure and picturesque scenery. And there were occasional touches

[1] *Waverley*, chap i., Introductory, *sub finem:* "It is from the great book of Nature . . . that I have adventurously essayed to read a chapter to the public"; also chap. v., *sub finem:* "I beg pardon, once and for all, of those readers who take up a novel merely for amusement. . . . My plan required that I should explain the motives on which its action proceeded. . . . I do not invite my fair readers . . . into a flying chariot drawn by hippogriffs, or moved by enchantment. Mine is a humble English post-chaise, drawn upon four wheels, and keeping His Majesty's highway."

of the preternatural. The author was not a great poet. He himself disclaims that ambition.[1] But his verse is living and dramatic. It obtained a success beyond all expectation; and it provoked a host of imitators, who soon wearied the public. Then a new style of ornament suddenly replaced in English poetry the mediæval bric-à-bac introduced by Scott.

The English had begun to realize that the war had not excluded them from the entire Continent of Europe. British troops had never quitted Sicily, and the British possessed another foothold in Portugal. From garrison to garrison the traveller could reach Greece, and beyond Greece Constantinople, the Bosphorus, and Asia. In 1809 the young Lord Byron, disgusted by the reception of his first volume of poems, hurled an insolent defiance at his critics and set out to discover the East. English men of letters had already sought inspiration in that quarter. Beckford's *Vathek* was pre-eminently a gorgeous picture of the East, not a didactic novel in the Voltairian style. And Southey was at work on *Kehama*. But Byron was the first to reveal to the British public the Mediterranean world as a magnificent reality of which every man, if he would, might be spectator, and where, given sufficient bravery, he might play an active part. The two first cantos of *Childe Harold* are the account of Byron's voyage. The *Giaour* appeared in May 1813, the *Bride of Abydos* before the end of the year, the *Corsair* at the beginning of 1814, and in the same year *Lara*. The public became familiar with a new type of scenery and a new jargon, with Ramadan and Bäiram, Maugrebins and Mamelukes, Cäiques and Tophäiks, Yatagans and Jereeds. And from the notes they learned that an emir is distinguished by his green robe,[2] and that when a Turk lost his temper "his beard curled." "I don't care,"[3] Byron wrote to his publisher, "one lump of sugar for my *poetry*, but for my *costume* and my *correctness*; on those points I will combat

[1] *Rokeby*, preface: "I shall not, I believe, be accused of ever having attempted to usurp a superiority over many men of genius, my contemporaries; but, in point of popularity, not of actual talent, the caprice of the public had certainly given me such a temporary superiority over men, of whom, in regard to poetical fancy and feeling, I scarcely thought myself worthy to loose the shoe-latch. On the other hand, it would be absurd affectation in me to deny that I conceived myself to understand more perfectly than many of my contemporaries the manner most likely to interest the great mass of mankind."

[2] *The Giaour*, 357.

[3] *Ibid*, 593.

lustily."[1] Six months had revolutionized the fashion in poetry. Scott replied to *Childe Harold* by *Rokeby*. Then the tide submerged him, and he abandoned poetry for prose. Byron had dethroned him and wore his crown. "Sir Walter reigned before me."

Whatever Byron might say, the change from Scott's romanticism to his own was no mere change of scenery. Byron's poetry was before all things personal, and the philosophy he versified was the antithesis of Sir Walter's moral idealism. Childe Harold was Byron himself, Conrad the Corsair his oriental incarnation. The Corsair became Lara. But what was Lara's country or epoch? Byron had renounced his oriental scene-painting—indeed, local colour of any kind. *Lara* is the direct precursor of *Manfred* and *Cain*, poems of philosophic rebellion, the apotheosis of a Satanic individualism.

The Byronic hero bids defiance to authority in every shape, to monarch, noble, and plutocrat. He rouses to revolt the pauper at home, the Greek in the Levant. And the leader of the rebels hates the very authority he wields. The taciturn despot Conrad disappears one night and abandons to its fate the horde of bandits which he rules. What is command, asks Manfred, but another slavery? From top to bottom society is nothing but a fabric of conventions, illusions and lies. Byron would shatter the idols. Patriotism, glory, honour, he denies them all. He rejects the entire system of hopes and fears on which human morality has been founded. He denies Providence and immortality. And if, after all, God did exist, and the soul were immortal, it would still be a duty to defy God. He is, to be sure, omnipotent. But what reason other than His omnipotent will can He produce in justification of the monstrous commands He lays upon us, the miserable destiny to which He condemns us? Since we are rational beings, we have the power to judge the tyrant who destroys us. For all eternity, damned without hope, but for ever free, we can defy the authority of God. "How?" Lucifer inquires of Cain.

> . . . By being
> Yourself in your resistance. Nothing can
> Quench the mind, if the mind will be itself
> And centre of surrounding things—'tis made
> To sway.[2]

[1] Byron to John Murray, November 14, 1813 (*Works, Letters and Journal*, ed. Prothero, vol. ii. p. 283).
[2] *Cain*, Act I, Scene 1.

In common with the whole of Europe, British society had been stirred to its depths. The war had been followed by riots. But the rebellious proletariat of the provinces had neither read Byron nor heard his name. And the educated middle class, who constituted the backbone of the Liberal Opposition, did not know what to make of this strange ally from the ranks of the nobility. Byron's true affinity was with the old Whig aristocracy, rebellious on principle, rather than with the new Opposition, hardworking men of business, whose objection to the aristocracy in power was precisely their dissolute morals and disorderly finance, and who loved everything that Byron hated—order, peace, civilization and comfort. Byron compelled admiration by the ascendancy of personal genius and by the very amazement he created. But in the country of his birth he was an anomaly. Since he met with nothing but mortification from his fellow-countrymen, he twice abandoned England for the Continent. The youthful Shelley, still unknown, and like Byron, a rebel against the beliefs and laws of his country, shared his voluntary exile. But was it, after all, voluntary? If both poets went to live in Italy, it was because British society had refused them a place. "The man who is exiled by a faction," wrote Byron, "has the consolation of thinking that he is a martyr; he is upheld by hope and the dignity of his cause, real or imaginary; he who withdraws from the pressure of debt may indulge in the thought that time and prudence will retrieve his circumstances; he who is condemned by the law has a term to his banishment, or a dream of its abbreviation, or, it may be, the knowledge or the belief of some injustice of the law, or of its administration in his own particular; but he who is outlawed by general opinion, without the intervention of hostile politics, illegal judgment or embarrassed circumstances, whether he be innocent or guilty, must undergo all the bitterness of exile, without hope, without pride, without alleviation. This case was mine."[1]

Let another ten years pass. Byron is dead. The poet Thomas Moore and his publisher Murray are his literary executors. In their possession are the poet's memoirs. Murray reads the manuscript, judges it scandalous and libellous. He summons his intimate friends and in their presence consigns the manuscript to the flames. No one can now read a work, which was perhaps a masterpiece.

[1] *Some Observations upon an Article in Blackwood's Magazine*, No. 39, August 1815 (*Works of Byron, Letters and Journals*, ed. Prothero, vol. iv. p. 478).

Murray has sacrificed a fortune, but he has saved British respectability.[1]

The success of Byron's poems would be inexplicable, if they had expressed no sentiments save hatred and scorn for everything which the English regarded with affection or reverence. Byron loved nature and the English loved nature with him. And he loved the sea whose praise is sung in every canto of *Childe Harold*, is indeed a *motif* never left long unheard from the moment of the hero's farewell to his native land to the majestic Invocation to the Ocean which concludes the poem. And his fellow countrymen born in an island and accustomed to regard the sea as their bulwark and their empire loved it with him. But his passion for nature insensibly acquired a character more tender and more religious. When about 1816 he came under the poetic and philosophic influence of Shelley it became coloured with a vague pantheism. To be absorbed in nature is to be united with the universal being.

> I live not in myself but I become
> Portion of that around me, and to me
> High mountains are a feeling.[2]

And it is a reconciliation in the bosom of deified nature with humanity itself.

> To fly from, need not be to hate mankind;
> All are not fit with them to stir and toil,
> Nor is it discontent to keep the mind
> Deep in its foundation.[3]

It is to return to the source of life, to discover the secret of immortality.

> And when at length the mind shall be all free
> From what it hates in this degraded form,
> When elements to elements conform
> And dust is as it should be, shall I not
> Feel all I see, less dazzling but more warm?
> The bodiless thought? The spirit of each spot?
> Of which, even now, I share at times the immortal lot.[4]

When Byron ceases to talk the language of devils and damned souls, and worships nature, his inspiration is akin to Words-

[1] Smiles, *Murray*, vol. i. pp. 442–3.
[2] *Childe Harold*, Canto 3, st. 72.
[3] *Ibid.*, Canto 3, st. 69.
[4] *Ibid.*, Canto 3, st. 74.

worth's own, and Wordsworth was, or was on the verge of becoming, England's national poet.[1]

It was in 1798 that Wordsworth and Coleridge had jointly published the *Lyrical Ballads*. Then Coleridge forsook poetry for metaphysics. The popular favourites were Scott and Byron, Mrs. Radcliffe and Kotzebue. "The invaluable works of our older writers," wrote Wordsworth sadly, "I had almost said the works of Shakespeare and Milton are driven into neglect by frantic novels, sickly and stupid German tragedies, and deluges of idle and extravagant stories in verse."[2] He ascribed this morbid fashion to the craving for violent sensations natural to a period of profound disturbance. But he continued to write without regard to the favour of the public. The *Prelude*, the most penetrating of his philosophic poems, was written in 1805. When peace was restored he hoped that his time had perhaps arrived. Not only did he publish in 1814 his *Excursion*, a curious poem at once theological and bucolic, half didactic and half descriptive; in 1815 he offered the public a second edition of his early poems and prefaced it by a literary manifesto, a declaration of principles.[3]

His poetical system was concerned with form and matter alike. For the form of poetry, Wordsworth denied the existence of a "poetic diction." A poet should be able to evoke the most poignant and the most profound emotions with the words and phrases of everyday life. For the matter, he denied the existence of a specific class of subjects which alone were capable of poetical treatment. The true poet has no need of extraordinary adventures, preternatural happenings or of the mysterious atmosphere in which events are clothed by distance in time or space. The joys and sorrows of daily life, the peaceful landscapes of the English country-side possess sufficient beauty. To render that beauty the poet need only describe them with a scrupulous veracity of detail. Does this mean that Wordsworth's

[1] For the Wordsworthian quality in Byron, see *Memoirs, Journal and Correspondence of Thomas Moore*, vol. iii. p. 161; G. Brandes, *Hauptströmungen, . . .* vol. iv., *Der Naturalismus in England*, p. 47.

[2] *Poems . . . including Lyrical Ballads and the Miscellaneous Pieces of the Author, with additional Poems, a new Preface and a Supplementary Essay in two Volumes*, London 1815. Wordsworth, however, had miscalculated; his hour had not yet come. See *Edinburgh Review*, November 1814, No. 47, Art. 1, Wordsworth's *Excursion* (vol. xxiv. pp. 1 sqq.); also *Quarterly Review*, October 1815, Art. 10, Wordsworth's *White Doe* (vol. xiv. pp. 201 sqq.).

[3] Preface, 1815.

theory of poetry reduces itself to the defence of prosaic realism? that his object is to justify little descriptive sketches after the manner of Crabbe, the poetical counterpart of the genre paintings of Wilkie and Mulready? There is much more than this in Wordsworth. He is not satisfied with correcting the literary taste of his readers. He has a further aim in view: "to reform and purify" their "moral sentiments." His often prosaic realism cloaks an ethical, indeed a religious purpose.

Everything in nature merits the observation and description of its humblest details because everything is the creation of a Will infinitely good. Wordsworth's poetry is based on a fundamental optimism, on the conviction of an essential harmony between nature and man. But unhappily, as man develops the consciousness of his existence as an independent individual, capable of thinking his own thoughts, and acting in accordance with his own will or caprice, he destroys this harmonious correspondence with the environment in which the Creator has ordained his birth. Civilization, the artificial life of the city, have blinded him to the true relationship between natural objects and himself. It is therefore the task of the philosopher by his appeal to reason, and of the poet by his more direct appeal to the feelings, to reconcile man with nature and with God. How should the poet, thus invested by Wordsworth with the mantle of the theologian, fulfil his august function? By making every poem a continuous symbol, expressive of the intimate bond between the human soul and the universe.

> To every natural form, rock, fruits or flower,
> Even the loose stones that cover the highway,
> I gave a moral life: I saw them feel,
> Or linked them to some feeling.[1]

Thus is man reunited with his native environment and his passions are disciplined. The very fact of employing verse as his medium furnishes the poet's narrative or description with a measure which restrains the movements of emotion. Man is restored by art to that natural serenity which is his *summum bonum.*

> From nature doth emotion come, and moods
> Of calmness equally are nature's gift:
> This is her glory: these two attributes
> Are sister horns that contribute her strength.
> Hence genius born to thrive by interchange

[1] *Prelude*, Book III.

Of place and excitation, finds in her
His best and purest friend; from her receives
That energy, by which he seeks the truth,
From her that happy stillness of the mind
Which fits him to receive it when unsought.[1]

Too often Wordsworth's poetry is as commonplace as prose, as dull as a sermon. But if we resign ourselves to the soft and equable current of these innumerable lines of blank verse, we cannot fail to experience the serene and pure loveliness of the emotions which he is analysing, and of the landscapes which he describes. And we shall understand the quality of his appeal to the English mind. To be sure Wordsworth does not, like the popular preacher, urge the fear of hell or man's need of a supernatural redemption. Sin and damnation play little part in his creed of optimism. He is the son not of Wesley but of Rousseau. But however little Methodists and Evangelicals might relish Rousseau's natural religion, his philosophy was the first emotional and Christian reaction against the critical rationalism of the 18th century. And in spite of themselves the Evangelicals felt his influence.

Bowles, Wordsworth's precursor, was an Anglican parson, and it was his conversion to Christianity which made Cowper the poet of nature before Bowles. Gisborne, the author of *Walks in the Forest*, was also an Evangelical; and a most sincere love of nature is displayed throughout the *Journal* of Wilberforce.[2] We may repeat about the nature poets our

[1] Prelude, Book XIII, opening.

[2] See especially his letter to Miss Wilberforce (Stock), April 16, 1786: "I was out before six, and made the fields my oratory, the sun shining as bright, and as warm as at Midsummer. I think my own devotions become more fervent when offered in this way amidst the general chorus, with which all nature seems on such a morning to be swelling the song of praise and thanksgiving, and except the time that has been spent at church and at dinner (and neither in the sanctuary nor at the table, I trust, had I a heart unwarmed with gratitude to the Giver of all good things) I have been all day basking in the sun" (*Life*, pp. 110–11). Or again in 1812: "Yesterday, I was fully occupied until the evening, when it would have been almost sacrilege and ingratitude not to walk for half an hour at least enjoying one of the finest sun-settings and moon-risings which my eyes ever beheld" (*ibid.*, vol. iv. p. 71). Cowper's poetry aided him to understand and love the beauties of natures (*ibid.*, vol. iii. pp. 417, 419, 420). Similar impressions are recorded by other Evangelicals, for instance by John Newton (Colquhoun, *Wilberforce and his Friends*, vol. i. p. 101), Lord Muncaster (*id. ibid.*, p. 318), and Porteus (R. Hodgson, *Life of Porteus*, pp. 29, 98).

earlier remarks about the landscape painters. British life possessed a twofold aspect. It was half urban, half rural. As the industrial revolution progressively concentrated labour in the towns, the country districts, deserted by the artisan and the labourer, were becoming enormous parks, solitudes abandoned to the contemplation of the artist. In the country he found rest, lived at peace with his Creator and almost fancied himself in Eden.

THE CULTIVATION OF THE NATURAL SCIENCES EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Protestantism and Science.

A superstitious literalism in the interpretation of the Bible discourages the exact observation of natural fact. And religious emotion may easily produce a distrust of natural science, with its claims to infallibility and universal validity. In England, however, the period which witnessed the Methodist propaganda and the revival of orthodox Protestantism witnessed also a series of important scientific discoveries which followed one another in rapid succession. One of two things, therefore, is certain; either we have exaggerated the part played by the Methodist revival in the formation of the national character, or this revival was after all less unfavourable to the scientific spirit, than would appear at first sight. In the first place, Protestantism is a book religion, a thoughtful and serious religion. From every Christian, worthy of the name, it demands a knowledge of the Bible, and thus encourages its adherents to learn reading and to that degree at least favours, if not the higher studies, at least elementary education. And secondly it was among the middle class, the mercantile and industrial class, that the new propaganda obtained the largest number of converts. But the manufactures which were now coming into existence and spreading so rapidly needed engineers and scientific experts. Moreover, the very sight of machinery inclines the mind to seek a mechanical explanation of all natural phenomena, and among them of human society. We must examine the entire system of education in Great Britain from the elementary schools to the Universities; and we must endeavour to determine the action on British education of these two forces, the Protestant revival and the industrial revolution. Wherever neither of these two forces was operative, we shall discover complete stagnation; where, on the contrary, either or both had made itself felt, vitality and progress.

Elementary Education.

As the rapid diffusion of scientific knowledge is only rendered possible by a well-organized system of education, so in turn the possibility of such a system depends on an extensive and systematic provision for elementary education. Calvinistic Scotland held up its system of elementary schools as a model to the entire United Kingdom. A statute of 1696, modified in 1803, provided for the lodging and salary in every parish of a schoolmaster to be appointed by the local landowners and the minister.[1] The Scottish system was not strictly speaking a system of free education; but pauper children were educated at the expense of the parish, and the others paid only a trifling fee for their schooling. They paid 1s. 6d. a quarter for instruction in reading, 2s. or 2s. 6d. for reading and arithmetic together, and as much for Latin; for Latin was taught in the elementary schools of Scotland.[2] Nor was it a system of compulsory education; but it was in fact universal. When a peasant was too poor to pay the master for the whole year, he made his children work on the land during the summer and sent them to school during the winter. When the area of a parish extended over many square miles, and it was, therefore, impossible for the children to attend school daily, the schoolmaster became an itinerant teacher and was lodged in turn by the inhabitants of the parish.

But we must not seek a relation of cause and effect between this development of primary education and the progress of industry. On the contrary, the growth of manufactures was accompanied by the decline of popular education.[3] The parishes were swamped in a chaos of houses and factories, and like the church, the school ceased to be a centre of social life. The children, conscripts of the factory, no longer possessed the time for education. All, or almost all, could still read; but the number of those who could not write was on the increase. Individual philanthropists were forced to supply as best they could the deficiencies of the official system by opening free schools in the poor quarters, or,

[1] 45 Geo. III, cap. 54. Till 1803 the master's salary ranged between a minimum of 200 Scottish marks (about £11 2s.), and a maximum of 300 marks (about £16 13s.). The Act of 1803 raised the minimum figure to 300 marks (about £16 13s.), the maximum to 400 marks (about £22 4s.).

[2] Adolphus, *British Empire*, vol. iv. p. 249. Cf. Froude, *Thomas Carlyle: a History of the First Forty Years of his Life*, vol. i. pp. 5–6; Bain, *James Mill*, pp. 6–7.

[3] Chalmers, *System of Parochial Schools*, pp. 15, 16.

like Dale and Owen, by attempting to educate the children in the factories where they worked. It was not in the manufacturing districts of the Clyde; it was in the country, and even in the Highlands, that travellers remarked the surprising contrast between the lack of material comforts, a squalor almost "Irish," and the universal zeal for education, the schools crammed with pupils, the reading-room and library in every village.[1] Intellectual Scotland was the old Scotland, rural and Calvinistic. And its capital was Edinburgh—the city not of the manufacturer and the merchant, but of the theologian, the lawyer and the University professor.

England possessed nothing similar. The endowed schools were private religious foundations where poor children received free education; sometimes also, free lodging, board and clothing. The oldest of these dated from the Middle Ages. The majority were about a century old. These were the charity schools founded by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.[2] But many of these had deteriorated. The nominal schoolmaster had made his post a sinecure, pocketed the bulk of the salary and delegated the work to a substitute miserably paid.[3] Nor was their number sufficient to supply the needs of a large nation. Only 150,000 children attended these schools[4] The dames' schools were institutions of a humbler type. Old women eked out a livelihood by taking charge of little children and giving them lessons in reading for about 3d. a week. When in 1819 the attempt was made for the first time to draw up educational statistics the number of children attending the dame schools would be estimated at about 53,000.[5]

There remains a third type of school; the schools of industry, opened in certain districts to provide pauper children with the rudiments of education, and to teach them a trade. But we must not forget how scanty was the

[1] R. Ayton, *Voyage round Great Britain*, vol. ii. p. 117; vol. iii. (continuation by W. Daniell), p. 17; vol. iv. pp. 78–9.

[2] Lecky, *History of England in the 18th Century*, vol. iii. p. 32.

[3] H. of C., June 20, 1816, Brougham's speech (*Parl. Deb.*, vol. xxxiv. p. 1233); July 7, 1817, Brougham's speech (*Parl. Deb.*, vol. xxxvi. pp. 1303–4).

[4] *A Digest of Parochial Returns: Education of the Poor*, vol. iii. p. 224. Statistics for 1819, 165,433, of whom 125,843 attended schools termed "ordinary," 39,590 schools termed "new."

[5] The exact figure was 53,624 (*A Digest . . .* vol. iii. p. 224). By "Dames' Schools" are meant, in the words on the introduction, "not only those kept by females, but also preparatory schools for very young children generally."

ground covered by the schools of industry. Out of the 194,914 Poor Law children between the ages of five and fourteen only 21,600 enjoyed the benefit even of the extremely elementary education imparted in these schools[1]. And we have now described the entire provision for primary education made by eighteenth-century England. To be sure, many reformers during the last fifty years had been scandalized by the educational condition of the country. Adam Smith,[2] himself a Professor of Glasgow University, and later Malthus,[3] had held up Scotland as a model for English imitation. And circumstances had apparently conspired to present the British legislature with an opportunity to introduce a system of elementary education more liberal even than the Scottish. When Sir Robert Peel and Robert Owen were utilizing the provisions of the old Poor Law to introduce the first legal interference with child labour it would surely have been possible to make further use of the Poor Law, and organize a system of popular education. Why could not elementary education have been treated as a form of poor relief and free schools provided from the poor rate? But it was in vain that Pitt in 1796, as part of his extensive scheme of Poor Law reform, proposed the universal provision of schools of industry.[4] It was in vain that Whitbread ten years later reopened the question and demanded in every parish a school, where children between seven and fourteen should have the right to free education for two years.[5] Pitt's Bill was not even put to the vote. Whitbread's Bill, passed as a matter of form by the Commons, was thrown out by the Lords. Only one instance can be found of State action and that of a most indirect nature. In 1812 on the motion of Wilberforce, an Act was passed by which the endowed schools were placed under the control of the Court of Chancery, to ensure the observance of the founder's

[1] Colquhoun, *Treatise on Indigence*, 1806, p. 142.

[2] *Wealth of Nations*, Book V, chap. i., Part 3, Art. 2 (Thorold Rogers' ed, vol. ii. p. 369).

[3] *Principle of Population*, Book IV., chap. ix.

[4] Eden, *State of the Poor*, vol. iii. p. 308, Appendix No. 11, *Mr. Pitt's Speech and Heads of his Bill for the Relief of the Poor*. See also Bentham's criticisms of Pitt's Bill, *Observations on the Poor Bill*, etc. (*Works*, ed. Bowring, vol. viii. pp. 369–439).

[5] See the debates, H. of C., February 19, April 24, July 13, August 4, 1807; H. of L., August 11, 1807 (*Parl. Deb.*, vol. viii. p. 865; vol. ix. pp. 423, 798, 1049*, 1174). The scheme was revived by Robert Owen in 1813. See *Diary of Lord Colchester*, April 30, May 4, 1813 (vol. ii. pp. 444–5).

wishes.[1] And the Act was a dead letter; had indeed, in the course of interminable debates, undergone several amendments which had weakened it considerably. If in the course of the past half-century popular education had made undeniable progress no credit was due to the State. It was the free initiative of private individuals, which had compensated in some measure for the inertia of the public authorities.

In 1780 at Gloucester a local journalist named Robert Raikes had founded with the help of an Anglican clergyman the first Sunday school. Every Sunday the children were taken twice to church, were taught the catechism and received elementary instruction from a teacher, who was either paid or gave his services as a charity. Raikes found imitators. In large towns such as Leeds and Birmingham a methodical system was adopted. The town was divided into districts and in each district two Sunday schools were opened—one for boys, the other for girls. In 1785 a *London Society for the establishment of Sunday Schools* was founded, and in 1803 a *Sunday School Union*, whose activity embraced the whole of England. In 1820 it was calculated that 477,225 children in England and Wales attended the Sunday schools.[2] What were the influences to which the movement owed its success? The sentimental humanitarianism whose foremost representative was Jean Jacques Rousseau had awakened the public conscience to a keener sense of duty to children. This occasioned a revival of interest in the theory of education and the publication of the first children's books written expressly for their amusement and instruction. It is probable that however little they might desire or even be conscious of it, writers so rigidly orthodox as Mrs. Trimmer and Mrs. Sherwood were under the influence of Rousseau, when they created in England a literature for children. Nevertheless, the inspiration of the Sunday school movement was obviously

[1] 52 Geo. III, cap. 101. An Act to provide a summary remedy in cases of abuses of trusts created for charitable purposes. Cf. *Observations on the Amended Bill now Depending in the House of Commons "for the Registering and Securing of Charitable Donations for the benefit of Poor Persons in England,"* by A. Higham, January 1810. See also H. of C., January 9, 1812 (*Parl. Deb.*, vol. xxi. p. 108), April 29, 1812 (*Parl. Deb.*, vol. xxii. p. 1119). For the agitation which culminated in the passage of the Act, see T. Bernard, *Of the Education of the Poor*, pp. 43, 45, 306 sqq.

[2] *A Digest*, vol. iii. pp. 1171, 1275. The figure for England was 452,817, for Wales 24,408. Brougham (June 28, 1820, *Parl. Deb.*, new series, vol. ii. p. 62) gives a different and a considerably lower figure, only 100,000.

religious and Evangelical. Its object was the sanctification of the Lord's Day and the salvation of souls.

John Wesley encouraged the movement. Henry Thornton was a member of the managing committee of the London Society from its foundation in 1785. Hannah More, at the suggestion of Wilberforce,[1] devoted ten years of her life to the foundation of Sunday schools in Gloucestershire. During these years she was the object of violent attacks from the local gentry and farmers, and from the Tory Press. Her schools, declared her opponents, were a danger to public order, the lower classes would learn in these schools to think for themselves, they were hotbeds of sedition political and religious, of Methodism, of Jacobinism. The charge of Jacobinism was an absurdity, the charge of Methodism was not so absurd. Hannah More's schoolmasters did occasionally set up as preachers, and transform her school into a Nonconformist *meeting-house*.[2]

Joseph Lancaster, a Quaker, opened in 1798 a small school in London in which he claimed to apply new educational principles. He reformed discipline through appealing to the motive of respect for the opinion of our fellows, by means of a rational method of honours and humiliations. He introduced original methods of learning to write and calculate with a slate and pencil; and he also borrowed from an Anglican clergyman named Dr. Bell the system of teaching by monitors. The master was assisted by a number of subordinate teachers taken from the pupils themselves, each of whom took charge under the master's supervision of a little band of ten children. Thanks to this economical system "one master could teach a thousand; or even a greater number of children, not only as well, but a great deal better, than they can possibly be taught by the old methods, and at an expense of less than five shillings a year for each."[3] Lancaster interested in his school his co-religionists, who were wealthy and always ready to spend money on philanthropy; and he secured the patronage of

[1] *Life of Wilberforce*, vol. i. pp. 246–7, letter to Hannah More, October 1789.

[2] For all this see Roberts, *Memoirs . . . of Mrs. Hannah More*, vol. ii. pp. 178, 215 sqq.; vol. iii. pp. 101 sqq., 115 sqq., and 254. See, for the schools founded by Mrs. Hannah More, T. Bernard, *Education of the Poor*, pp. 112 sqq. For the Nonconformist Sunday schools and the attempts made by the Anglican clergy to obtain their condemnation, as an infringement of the Conventicle Act, see the *Times*, August 7, 1811.

[3] *Edinburgh Review*, November 1810, Art. 3, *Education of the Poor* (vol. xvii. p. 67).

Lord Somerville, the Duke of Bedford, and two princes. In 1805 his school, now a free school, contained provision for 1,000 pupils. It served also as his training college. His monitors were apprentices of the scholastic profession, trained to undertake the management of other schools founded in the provinces on the same pattern.[1] But Lancaster was a bad administrator, and squandered his funds. In 1807 he found himself faced with a deficit of £3,000. His friends came to his assistance and founded the *Royal Lancastrian Institution*, which became in 1814, when further extravagancies had led to the final ejection of Lancaster, under the title of the *British and Foreign School Society*, a powerful agency for the promotion of popular education.

What elements composed this group of educators? When Wilberforce was pressed to accept the position of vice-president on the committee of the Lancastrian Institution he refused. He had no liking for a method of education which rested entirely on emulation and vanity. But he took a fortnight to consider his decision.[2] And the active members of the Institution were precisely those philanthropic Non-conformists, Quakers or members of the three primitive denominations who enjoyed so high a degree of his regard and sympathy, with whom he had so often worked.[3] Side by side with them were to be found Bentham and his friends, men of no religion, steeped in the ideas of eighteenth-century France. They were attracted by the experimental and mechanical character of Lancaster's educational methods. It was at the Lancastrian Institution that James Mill was initiated into the propaganda of the reformers; and it was there that Brougham made the acquaintance of Mill, and through Mill of Bentham.[4] They founded a branch of the Society at Westminster. Bentham offered his house for use as a school, and composed, as a programme of studies, his *Chrestomathia*, a treatise on Utilitarian Education.[5] Be-

[1] For the growth of the system in England, see *The Philanthropist*, vol. i. pp. 118 sqq. (1811).

[2] *Life of Wilberforce*, vol. iii. p. 478.

[3] For the part played by Quakers in the Lancastrian Institution, see *Life of William Allen*, vol. i. pp. 93 sqq., 109 sqq., 112, 113, 114, 132, 151 sqq., 166.

[4] For the Benthamite element see Graham Wallace, *Life of Francis Place*, pp. 93 sqq.; also my own *Formation du Radicalisme Philosophique*, vol. ii. pp. 247 sqq.

[5] *Chrestomathia: being a Collection of Papers, explanatory of the Design of an Institution proposed to be set on foot under the name of the Chrestomathic Day School, for the use of the Middling and Higher Ranks in Life* (*Works*, ed. Bowring, vol. viii. pp. 1 sqq.).

tween believers and rationalists collisions were inevitable. But the alliance subsisted. The Benthamites were the theorists of the industrial revolution, the mouthpiece of the class in which on the other hand the Evangelical propaganda had made the most marked progress. The School Society, therefore, was a perfect expression of the mentality of the young middle class—half Protestant, half industrial, passionately philanthropic.

Religiously the Lancastrian schools were neutral schools or, to speak more accurately, were neutral as between the different Christian sects. The reading of the Bible was obligatory, but it was unaccompanied by commentary or catechism. To use the formula of James Mill, whose private convictions favoured a more radical type of neutrality, they were schools for all, not for Churchmen only. Hence the hostility of the High Church party.

Mrs. Trimmer denounced a method of education which destroyed first the fear of man, then the fear of God, and stigmatized Lancaster's schools as training schools for the army of the approaching revolution.[1] For Daubeny Lancaster was a deist, a new Julian the Apostate, an emissary of Satan.[2] In a public lecture Coleridge, who had now become the philosopher of the High Church party, read a passage from the book in which Lancaster explains his method, denounced his schools, which he compared to prisons or convict stations, and flung the book to the ground with a theatrical gesture of disgust.[3] Something must be done to counteract the mischief. Anglicans remembered that the system of teaching by monitors was after all the invention of an Anglican. They set up Bell against Lancaster. The Archbishop of Canterbury entrusted Bell with the management of a charity school, the Bishop of Durham gave him a rich living. In 1811 there was formed under the patronage of the entire Episcopate a rival society to the Lancastrian Association, the "National Society for the Education of the Poor in accordance with the Principles of the Established Church."

The directors of the National Society were animated by a spirit narrowly clerical and Tory.[4] In 1812, at the very

[1] *Edinburgh Review*, October 1806, No. 17, Art. 12, *Mrs. Trimmer on Lancaster's Plan of Education* (vol. ix. pp. 177 sqq.).

[2] *Edinburgh Review*, November 1810, No. 33, Art. 3, *Education of the Poor* (vol. i. pp. 69, 83).

[3] *Quarterly Review*, October 1811, Art. 15, *Bell and Lancaster's System of Education* (vol. vi. p. 285).

[4] The spirit which inspired the founders of the society is evident

moment when the New Toleration Act was being passed, the Bishops attempted to confine admission to the Society's schools to children who attended the Anglican church on Sunday. The result of such a decision would have been to force into the Lancastrian schools the masses who floated between the Church and Methodism, were willing that their children should be taught the Anglican Catechism, but who often preferred to hear in the Wesleyan chapel a more homely and more fervent preacher than the clergyman of the Establishment. After six months' resistance the Episcopate yielded.[1] Here also the Evangelicals had exercised a moderating influence. Nevertheless, the new society was a creation of the High Church, in which the Evangelicals played a very subordinate part. Certainly they were not hostile nor even indifferent to the education of the lower classes. Wilberforce and his friends had been the first to plan, between 1802 and 1804, an Anglican scheme of primary education.[2] But owing to the force of circumstances they had been squeezed out between the Dissenters and Rationalists of the *British and Foreign Society* on the one hand, and the High Churchmen of the *National Society* on the other.

Pessimists still complained and declared the results of these educational efforts extremely unsatisfactory. In 1806 Colquhoun estimated at 2,000,000 the number of children in England and Wales who received no education whatever.[3] The philologist Alexander Murray maintained in 1810 that three-quarters of the agricultural labourers were unable to read.[4] When the first official statistics were compiled in 1819 the number of children attending school in England and Wales amounted to a fifteenth of the entire population; in Scotland, where a knowledge of reading was believed to be universal, to a tenth.[5] But these figures require interpretation.

---

from the fact that the term "national" was only adopted under protest. Since the word was derived from French, it was suspect of Jacobinism (Overton, *English Church*, p. 239).

[1] For the question, see *Diary of Lord Colchester*, January 1812 *passim*, and then May 4th and June 18th, 24th, 27th (vol. ii. pp. 352 sqq.).

[2] *Life of Wilberforce*, vol. iii. p. 72; T. Bernard, *Education the Poor*, pp. 240 sqq.

[3] Colquhoun, *Treatise on Indigence*, p. 143.

[4] *Archibald Constable*, vol. i. p. 295, A. Murray to A. Constable, December 29, 1810.

[5] *Digest of Parochial Returns*, 1819, vol. iii. pp. 1171*, 1275* (1) *England and Wales.*—Total population, 10,155,328; number

In the first place this proportion is an average. In certain western[1] and midland[2] counties and in the four northern counties[3] the proportion approached, equalled or even exceeded the Scottish figure. In England as in Scotland, although to a lesser degree, a popular Protestantism deeply rooted in the national character favoured the education of the people. This was the reason that the agricultural counties which had been hardly touched by the new industrial civilization, counties such as Devonshire, Lincolnshire and Westmorland, contained so very few illiterates; that during the 18th century so many celebrated men, engineers like Scott and Telford, political writers like Gifford and Cobbett, scientists and scholars like Dalton and Porson had risen from the ranks of the people; that the development of manufacturers could draw from the country the necessary staff of engineers and foremen. Again the immediate effect of the industrial revolution, since it involved child labour, had been to lower the standard of popular education. The number of illiterates was nowhere greater than in Middlesex and Lancashire,[4] precisely the two industrial centres of the nation. But these conditions aroused the zeal of the philanthropists. Evangelicals and Nonconformists began a campaign against this glaring abuse by the foundation of new educational institutions. Such was the success of their propaganda among the governing classes that in 1815 no

---

attending school, 674,883 children. (2) *Scotland.*—Total population, 1,885,688; number attending school, 176,525 children.

[1] H. of C., April 24, 1807, Mr. Davies Giddy's speech: "That in a part of England that he lived in (in Cornwall) education was pretty generally diffused, at least so much of it, that almost every person there had learned reading, writing and something of arithmetic" (*Parl. Deb.*, vol. ix. p. 543). Nevertheless, the statistics of 1819 do not show that in Cornwall the proportion of children attending school exceeded the average for the entire country. On the other hand, they show for the adjoining county of Devonshire out of a population of 383,308 a school attendance of 30,633. The proportion is a twelfth.

[2] Derbyshire one-twelfth, Lincolnshire one-eleventh, Nottingham one-eleventh, Rutland one-ninth.

[3] Northumberland one-tenth, Durham one-eleventh, Cumberland one-ninth, Westmorland one-ninth. H. of C., April 24, 1807, Whitbread's speech: "Westmorland, the best educated county in England" (*Parl. Deb.*, vol. ix. p. 550). See also, for the schools in the northern counties, Tuke, *North Riding*, 1800, pp. 317–18.

[4] Proportion of school attendance in Middlesex one-twenty-fourth, in Lancashire one-twenty-first.

Member of Parliament would have dared to maintain, as had been maintained during the anti-Jacobin scare, that the promotion of popular education was the work of an anarchist and a revolutionary. The two great parties now vied with each other in the attempt to capture the popular mind by the foundation of the larger number of schools. Undoubtedly the statistics of 1819 do not enable us to gauge accurately the effects of their rivalry. They merely inform us of the number of children attending school in England at that date; they do not inform us whether their numbers were on the increase, were stationary or on the decline. But we may, however, call attention to the fact that of the 650,000 English children attending school, close on 150,000 attended schools founded since 1803 where the methods of Bell and Lancaster were applied. We can only conclude that, if the number of illiterates was still enormous it was rapidly decreasing.[1]

Secondary Education. The Public Schools.

If the English were disposed to admit the superiority of the Scottish system of primary education they were by no means prepared to extend that admission to what we now term secondary education. In Scotland secondary education among the upper classes was domestic, education by a private tutor, a poor devil wretchedly paid, known as the dominie. For children of the middle classes, as for the hard-working children of the proletariat, it was an education in the day schools which existed in every town large or small throughout the Kingdom. Of these the most celebrated was the High School of Edinburgh.[2]

[1] *Digest of Parochial Returns*, 1819, vol. iii. pp. 1171*. Children in endowed schools, 165,433; in unendowed schools, 478,849. Total 644,282. In new endowed schools, 39,590; in new unendowed day schools, 105,582. Total 145,172. And these statistics take no account of the Sunday schools. If the Sunday schools were taken into account the proportion of school attendance to the total population would practically equal the proportion in Scotland. Scotland, 1,805,688: school attendance inclusive of Sunday schools, 229,974 (proportion almost equals one-eighth). England, 9,543,610: school attendance inclusive of Sunday schools, 1,115,099 (proportion equals one-eighth). Wales, 611,718: school attendance inclusive of Sunday schools, 55,009 (proportion equals one-fourteenth). Obviously the education given in the Sunday schools was elementary in the extreme. Nevertheless, those who had attended a Sunday school cannot be regarded as absolutely illiterate.

[2] Cockburn, *Memorials*, pp. 3 sqq., 249; Adolphus, *British Empire*, vol. iv. pp. 260–1.

The English, on the other hand, had adopted the boarding-school system. But the English boarding school bore no resemblance whatever to the boarding school, as organized on the Continent by the Jesuits and later by the Napoleonic university. The English boarding school was unique, unlike any other educational establishment in the world; and the English were intensely proud of it and saw in it one of the sources of their national greatness. "The Battle of Waterloo," said Wellington, "was won on the playing fields of Eton."[1] All the English boarding schools were originally religious foundations—royal foundations like Eton and Westminster, or the foundations of wealthy benefactors, like Charterhouse and Merchant Taylors' School; and they had been founded for the free education of a fixed number of poor children. From the beginning paying pupils had been admitted in addition to the scholars. When the number of these paying pupils did not exceed the number of scholars, the school, attended by a small number of children, had remained the primitive grammar school, a charitable institution with very little prestige. In other schools, on the contrary, the paying pupils had become the majority.[2] In this way arose the great public schools of modern England—Eton, Winchester, Westminster, Charterhouse, Rugby, and Harrow—to which the nobility and gentry were practically obliged to send their children.[3]

The teaching given in these schools was, in conformity with the traditional spirit of the grammar school from which they were descended, exclusively literary and classical. The boys composed Latin "declamations" and Latin and Greek verse. Arithmetic, algebra, geometry, and geography were taught only as extra subjects, and in a very elementary form, during the few hours of study on holidays and half-holidays.[4] It was in vain that the middle-class opposition, the group of Benthamites, were already protesting against an education devoid of every "utilitarian" feature and ill-adapted to the needs of a practical age. The parents whose

[1] Even if the saying is apocryphal (Percy M. Thornton, *Harrow School and Surroundings*, p. 352), the legend is typical.

[2] At Harrow in 1816 out of 295 boys there were only three scholars. In 1818 and 1819 the number of scholars, in spite of all the efforts made to increase it, did not exceed ten (Percy M. Thornton, *Harrow School and Surroundings*, p. 230).

[3] Adolphus, *British Empire*, vol. iii. pp. 73 sqq. See, for a criticism of the system, *Edinburgh Review*, August 1818, No. 32, Art. 3, *Public Schools of England* (vol. xvi. pp. 326 sqq.).

[4] Sir C. H. Maxwell Lyte, *Eton College*, pp. 321 sqq.

sons went to a public school were deaf to these compl. 1796
They were not educating their sons for commerce; d all
were indifferent to science. What they valued in the gntil
public schools of the country was their aristocratic een
manly system of education, if indeed we can speak ohal
system, where there reigned a sovereign contempt for syst of
of any kind. g-

The masters taught their classes, and in cases of serione insubordination they interfered and flogged the offendery. Otherwise they left the boys to themselves. There were nll masters, like the French *maîtres d'études*, whose province was the continual maintenance of discipline. Discipline was left in the hands of the older boys, the members of the sixth form, which constituted the senate, the ruling aristocracy of the public school. Servants were few or none. The boys, therefore, must provide their own service. The younger boys, the members of the lower forms, were the fags of the older boys, waxed their shoes, boiled the water for their tea, carried their cricket balls and bats. An enormous society of boys between the ages of eight and eighteen governed by an unwritten code of its own making, an almost free republic of 100, 200 or 500 members, a club where even before adolescence a boy was imbued with the spirit of an aristocratic nation: such was the English public school.

The British aristocracy was not a closed caste. The public schools were not open only to the sons of gentlemen and closed to commoners. A great manufacturer, a wealthy banker, had only to renounce commerce for his son and send him to a public school and the University: henceforward his son belonged to the ruling class and lived on a footing of equality with the sons of noblemen and gentlemen who had been his school-fellows. Moreover, the British aristocracy was an aristocracy of equals, not nicely graded like the German aristocracy. And this lesson also was learned at the public school. The son of the noblest and wealthiest parents began as a fag, the humblest ended as a member of the Sixth. Common membership of the same school, a source of pride to all the boys alike, levelled every distinction of wealth or rank.[1] When a little English boy of eight left his home to enter a public school his family felt that he was really going out into the world.[2] No longer

[1] Bulwer, *England and the English*, p. 159. "Boys at a public school are on an equality" (p. 160). "At no place are the demarcations of birth and fortune so faintly traced as at a school."

[2] *Journal of Lady Holland*, vol. ii. p. 236: "On Monday, the 17th (January 1808), we took Charles to Eton. He is now launched

is father kiss him on the cheek; he will treat him
Th forward as one gentleman treats another. When ten
sch later the same boy, now a young man, exchanges
res or Winchester for Oxford or Cambridge he will nurse
on conviction, exaggerated sometimes to the pitch of
un urdity, that experience has nothing further to teach him.
ar ng him face to face with a young man of the same age,
E: o, for special reasons, has received a private education
sc home: how striking is the contrast between the confidence
l d conceit of the former, the timidity and awkwardness
F the latter. They had not undergone the same initiation;
ey did not belong to the same world.[1]

On the whole the public school belonged to the old England of the 18th century. The new moral forces, whose influence was, as we have seen, so powerful among the middle class, had not yet penetrated these citadels of aristocracy. Just as the public-school education was neither scientific nor commercial, but exclusively classical, so among masters and boys alike Evangelicalism was unknown. The masters were Anglican clergymen of the old type and the religion of a public school, if we can call it religion, was crude in the extreme. The prevailing morality was the morality of the tribe, tyrannical, often barbarous. The bullying was severe and the fags were often tortured by their fag-masters. As among the Spartan youth, certain forms of theft were accounted permissible, even honourable, and landlord and farmer in the neighbourhood of a public school must be prepared for constant raids. Rebellions against masters were frequent. Byron began his career as a rebel in the great Harrow mutiny which broke out in 1808 against an unpopular headmaster.[2] Games were played with a savagery which knew no rules. They had not yet been submitted to the scientific, almost pedantic regulation which they would receive a few years later. The first cricket

---

into the sea of human affairs; the *world* of a public school he will find very different from the world seen from under the paternal roof."

[1] Miss Austen, *Sense and Sensibility*, chap. xxxvi: ". . . talking of his brother, and lamenting the extreme *gaucherie* which he really believed kept him from mixing in proper society, he candidly and generously attributed it much less to any natural deficiency, than to the misfortune of a private education, while he himself, though probably without any particular, any material superiority by nature, merely from the advantage of a public school was as well fitted to mix in the world as any other man."

[2] Percy M. Thornton, *Harrow School and Surroundings*, p. 219.

match between Harrow and Eton was played in 1796 without the knowledge of the respective authorities, and all the boys who took part in it were flogged.[1] It was not until 1822 that the first official match would be played between the two schools and that Eton would engage professional instructors for cricket.[2] Nevertheless, we should beware of exaggerating, as many English writers are inclined to exaggerate, the importance of the reforms effected in the discipline of the public schools during the first half of the 19th century. When in 1827 Thomas Arnold will begin his reform he will make no revolutionary changes; he will proceed along the lines already laid down. He will need only to make use of the group morality already existing in a barbarous form; to appeal to the corporate pride of the boys, especially of the senior boys; to subject the customs of the school to the control, sometimes visible, more often invisible, of the masters; and he will transform Rugby, to employ his own expression, into a nursery of "Christian gentlemen."

When a boy left school he proceeded to the University. He became a *student* at one of the four Scottish universities, Edinburgh, Glasgow, St. Andrews, Aberdeen, or an *undergraduate* of Oxford or Cambridge. To these two terms corresponded two distinct types of university.

The Scottish Universities.

The Scottish universities can hardly be regarded as institutions of higher education.[3] The student entered at about the age of fourteen—sometimes even younger; some students were barely ten on leaving either a grammar school, or in the majority of cases one of those parochial schools in which, as we know, Latin was taught. A four-year course was the rule, or in technical terminology a course of four consecutive sessions. The first of these sessions was spent in completing the very elementary knowledge of Latin which the Scottish boy brought with him to the university, and in beginning the study of Greek. With the second session the studies, though still elementary—the students were only fifteen or sixteen—changed their character. Logic was

[1] Sir C. H. Maxwell Lyte, *Eton College*, p. 369.

[2] C. Wordsworth, *Annals of my Early Life*, pp. 9 sqq.

[3] For the system of studies in the Scottish universities see an excellent article, written from the English standpoint—fifteen years later, indeed, than our period, but of which we can, nevertheless, make use with the necessary reservations (*Quarterly Journal of Education*, vol. iv. pp. 21 sqq., 234 sqq.).

compulsory. Cockburn has told us what a revelation the first lectures of Finlayson were to himself and his fellow students. "Until we heard him, few of us knew that we had minds: and still fewer were aware that our intellectual operations had been analysed, and formed the subject of a science."[1] The course of logic was followed in the third year by moral philosophy, which comprised a smattering of metaphysics, moral philosophy in the strict sense, the philosophy of history, and political economy. At Edinburgh, Glasgow and St. Andrews there was a special course of political economy. After the course of moral philosophy came the course of natural philosophy, in other words of physics and chemistry. When to these courses we add the special course of mathematics, which in the second and third years served as a preparation for the course of natural philosophy, and remember that in the three universities of Edinburgh, Glasgow and St. Andrews, and the two colleges of Aberdeen, neither the subjects taught nor the order in which they were taught were identical, we obtain an idea, which, if lacking in detail, is quite sufficient for our purpose, of the curriculum of the four universities. It is the curriculum, comprehensive without being overburdened, of a superior type of secondary education. England did not possess its equivalent.

When this four-year course had been completed, it was followed by years of specialized and professional study. Suppose the student now eighteen years old intended to enter the ministry: he could either live in the country, acting possibly as a schoolmaster, and content himself with an annual visit to the university to attest his presence by reading a sermon; or he could remain at the university and follow a four-year course of theology. If he wished to become a barrister or a doctor, he was provided at Edinburgh and Glasgow and, up to a certain point, at the Marischal College in Aberdeen, with excellent schools of law and medicine which enjoyed a world-wide reputation.

The English readily found fault with the system of education followed in the Scottish universities. They pointed to the inadequate teaching of the humanities, of Latin and Greek. The classical course at a Scottish university was identical with the curriculum of an English public school; nor was it obligatory for students of medicine. Was Presbyterian Scotland so averse to the classics because it cherished Puritan prejudices against pagan antiquity? They criticized the shortness of the sessions, barely twenty-two weeks in

[1] *Memorials*, p. 21.

all—from November till Easter. They criticized even the method of teaching. The students were non-collegiate, living in lodgings in the town and only attending the university for lectures. The lectures were public and had degenerated into elaborate displays held before audiences of a hundred or more students. There was no intimacy between professors and students. And they denounced the absence of a qualifying entrance examination, of a serious final examination. Every student who had followed the courses for four years left the university with the degree of M.A. But national jealousy counted for much in these English criticisms, which invited counter criticism.

The quality of the audience to which the Scottish professors lectured was itself a compensation for the alleged deficiencies of the curriculum. A system of scholarships regularly organized opened the universities to the poorest Scotsman, if he were a genuine student. In virtue of a resolution passed by the General Assembly in 1645 every presbytery which comprised at least twelve parishes must provide an annual scholarship of a value not less than £5 12s., and this scholarship was payable for four consecutive years.[1] In this way the replenishment of the Presbyterian ministry was permanently secured. It is true that the scholarship was apparently insufficient to defray the entire cost of life at the university—the fees payable to the professors, which varied with the course and university between ten shillings and three guineas, and the cost of board and lodging. But the poor student knew how to eke out his resources. His wants were few. Every week a messenger came in from the country, brought him oatmeal, potatoes, salt butter and eggs, and took back linen to wash and clothes to be mended[2] Between the lectures he repeated them for the benefit of some wealthy student. And during the six months' vacation, indeed the shortness of the session was in part designed to make university life possible for him, he either gained a livelihood as tutor in a noble family or returned to the spade or the plough on his father's farm. For the Scottish student brought with him to the university that enthusiasm for learning which

[1] Adolphus, *British Empire*, vol. iv. p. 249. The earliest statistics which deal with the matter, compiled in 1825, give a total of 72 scholars at St. Andrews, 79 at Glasgow, 80 at Edinburgh, and for the two Aberdeen colleges, 134 at King's College (out of a total number of 235 students) and 106 at Marischal College (*Quarterly Journal of Education*, 1832, vol. iv. p. 36).

[2] J. A. Froude, *Thomas Carlyle*, vol. i. pp. 20 sqq.

had already during his childhood enabled him to make such an excellent use of the parish school.

And the Scottish professor, though faced with so vast an audience, had devised the means, whatever his critics might allege, of establishing contact with his pupils. The custom which Jardine had introduced at Edinburgh of devoting either a portion of every lecture or an entire lecture once a week to the correction of exercises and oral questions, was becoming more common every year.[1] And if the entrance examination was unknown at Glasgow, Aberdeen and St. Andrews, there was a formal public examination at the beginning or end of every session, calculated to stimulate the ambition of the students. The same object was served by the prizes which had been founded for the students who composed the best essays. Sometimes these prizes were awarded by the vote of the students. And if the Scottish professor was less occupied by teaching than the professors of other universities, the students benefited by the provision of distinguished teachers to whom the six months' vacation gave sufficient leisure to compose the works which rendered them famous. The neglect of the classics is undeniable. But it was precisely because the classics did not occupy a predominant position in the curriculum that the education given at the Scottish universities possessed that philosophic and scientific character which was its distinctive feature. Even the course of rhetoric was marked by a scientific and abstract quality. We should, indeed, describe it as a course of æsthetics, in which, in the language of an official report, it was the aim of the professor "to invest criticism with the character of a science by relating the productions of genius to the operations of our physical and mental nature."

Alone in the United Kingdom the Scottish universities possessed an original school of philosophy. The tradition had been continued for three-quarters of a century—at Glasgow by Hutcheson, Adam Smith and Reid, at Aberdeen by Beattie, at Edinburgh by Dugald Stewart and Thomas Brown. For the historian of philosophy the Scottish philosophers are pre-eminently critics of the systems of Berkeley, Hume and Hartley. But we must be sure that we understand the nature of their criticism. In Berkeley they criticized his idealism, in Hume his scepticism. That is to say they rejected the metaphysical conclusions which these philosophers believed themselves to have reached by the

[1] *Appendix to General Report of Commissioners on the Universities and Colleges of Scotland*, 1831, p. 246.

application of their method. But they did not reject the method itself. They criticized also the psychologists of Hartley's school, who explained our entire mental life by a mechanical association of ideas, without however drawing an idealist or sceptical conclusion. But their criticism was motived by a distrust of Hartley's generalizations as unwarrantably rash, and by the suspicion that his system was too simple to explain the complex phenomena of psychology. Thomas Brown, who had occupied Dugald Stewart's chair since 1810, followed so closely the French ideologists of the school of Condillac that he was even charged with plagiarism.[1] And his famous analysis of the origin of the idea of space is in perfect conformity with the principles of the Hartleians. In short, the entire question debated between Berkeley, Hume and the followers of Hartley on the one hand, and the Scottish philosophers of "common sense" on the other, is confined to the application of a method, admitted as their common starting-point by all the disputants alike, the method initiated by Locke. For all alike philosophy is reducible ultimately to psychology, and is essentially experimental and positive. In his important *Dissertation on the Progress of Philosophy*, published in 1815, Dugald Stewart, the most illustrious member of the Scottish school, maintained that by metaphysics we must understand "not Ontology or Pneumatology, but the Inductive Philosophy of the Human Mind."[2]

The teaching of science was as well organized in the Scottish university as the teaching of philosophy. All the great British physicians of the 18th century, with the exception of the brothers, Hunter, had been Scottish professors. Black, the eighteenth-century physicist who was the immediate precursor of modern chemistry and anticipated most closely the modern theory of heat, lectured at Glasgow, and it was in his laboratory that Watt began his researches. And Watt, alone of the great English inventors, worked from the standpoint of theoretical, not merely of applied, science. Black's work on latent heat had been continued by his pupil Irvine, a professor at the same university, and later by Crawford, whose first experiments were made at Glasgow. Leslie, who published in 1804 a classic "on the nature and propagation of heat," lectured at Edinburgh University. Robison and Playfair were professors of repute. To all these

[1] Sir William Hamilton, *Discussions on Philosophy and Literature* etc., 3rd ed., 1866, p. 44.

[2] *Preface to the First Dissertation, Supplement to the Encyclopædia Britannica*, vol. i. p. 17.

savants the universities made very considerable grants of money for the purchase of the necessary apparatus. In 1831 the Professor of Physics at Edinburgh, even when lamenting the inadequate equipment of his laboratory, will be obliged to admit that no institution in Britain possessed as good a laboratory.[1]

The Scottish universities were centres of an intense intellectual activity. The closing years of the 18th century and the opening years of the 19th marked the zenith of their greatness. Not only the students, but the entire intelligentsia of Edinburgh, were to be seen taking notes at Dugald Stewart's lectures.[2] Around the universities debating societies flourished, at which, in virtue of a tradition almost unquestioned, the students possessed entire liberty to raise any question they pleased, theoretical or practical.[3] A society of this kind was the Academical Society at Edinburgh, founded in 1796 and now on the decline. Another was the Speculative Society, which dated from 1764 and was enjoying undiminished prosperity. It was at the Speculative Society that about the year 1800 the youthful adherents of the two political parties had engaged stirring contests. Lord Henry Petty, sent by his father, Lord Lansdowne, to make a course of studies at Edinburgh, took part in these debates, and there made the acquaintance of the men who were later, as orators or publicists, to constitute the principal support of the Liberal Opposition—Brougham, Horner and Jeffrey. For if the English decried the system which obtained at the Scottish universities, their actions gave their criticism the lie. It had formerly been the fashion among the nobility to complete the education of a young nobleman by a "grand tour" on the Continent in the company of a tutor. Twenty-five years of Continental war had rendered the tour impossible, and it was now to Edinburgh University that noblemen often sent their sons on leaving the public school to complete their education before going up to Oxford or Cambridge. We have already had occasion to depict the spirit of Scotland, at once liberal and austere. To a laxer England Scottish Calvinism was a teacher of serious morality and serious thought.

[1] *Appendix to General Report*, 1831, p. 134.
[2] Cockburn, *Life of Jeffrey*, p. 119; *Memorials*, pp. 174–5.
[3] *Ibid.* vol. i. pp. 51 sqq.; *Memorials*, pp. 27 sqq., 73–4; *Memoirs . . . of Francis Horner*, vol. i. p. 56.

Oxford and Cambridge.

Very different was the system followed at Oxford and Cambridge.[1] For over a century the nominal professors had lacked an audience. Both universities had alike degenerated into agglomerations of independent "colleges." The college was a species of lay monastery where celibate fellows resided with their pupils. There was no division of labour between the colleges. Every college claimed to teach every subject the student needed to learn. There was little or no division of labour between the tutors of the same college. Every tutor had the charge of a certain number of pupils, whose entire course he directed by lectures delivered to a class, or by individual tuition. Not apparently a system favourable to education. But the defenders of the English university maintained that the system possessed great moral advantages, that it brought teacher and pupil into close personal contact. They also called attention to the fact that the English universities were attended by students of riper years than the students of a Scottish university. The young Englishman was eighteen, not fourteen, years old when he arrived at the university. One thing at any rate is certain—the important part played by the two Universities in the intellectual and moral life of the nation. Was this position justified? If so, what was its justification?[2]

Oxford was pre-eminently the Tory university. Every new intellectual movement was an object of suspicion or abhorrence whether it were Methodism, which, though born like so many religious movements at Oxford, had not prospered at its birthplace, or the Jacobinism of the French revolutionaries and of those Englishmen whose sympathies lay to a certain extent with them. A number of students suspected of Wesleyan leanings had been sent down. No town in England had subscribed more liberally to the fund on be-

[1] To be complete mention must be made of Dublin University. It consisted merely of a single college, where the tutorships had become sinecures, since the students were no longer in residence and put in an appearance at Trinity College, only to receive their degrees. The entire importance of Trinity College lay in the fact that it was a stronghold of English Protestantism in Ireland.

[2] See, for an excellent description of the teaching given at the Universities, its deficiencies, the progress actually accomplished, and a comparison with the Scottish universities, the *Quarterly Review*, June 1827, Art. 8, *State of the Universities* (vol. xxxvi. pp. 216 sqq.). The article was the work of Charles Lyell. (Smiles, *Murray*, vol. ii. p. 267.)

half of the *emigré* priests. It is true that in 1809 Lord Grenville, the Leader of the Opposition, author of the Act which abolished slavery and a supporter of Catholic emancipation, had been elected chancellor of the university in opposition to Lord Eldon, the intimate friend and political adviser of King George. But such manifestations of independence were few. The High Church reigned at Oxford. It was not the spiritual and other-worldly High Church that would be born in fifteen years' time, but the High Church of the 18th century, with its stolid conservatism and imperturbable apathy. The descriptions of Gibbon,[1] Bentham,[2] and Jeffrey[3] have rendered the intellectual torpor of Oxford a byword. There was a complete absence of rivalry between colleges or individuals. Men did not become undergraduates or fellows by passing an examination or even by election. The great public schools enjoyed a monopoly of scholarships and fellowships alike and distributed them at their unfettered discretion. Wealthy students kept hounds, passed entire nights over the bottle, gambled for high stakes. Nor did the University impose on candidates for the degree of "Bachelor of Arts" any examination worthy of the name. Three questions made public in advance in theology, logic and grammar, the answers to which existed in a stereotyped form and passed from candidate to candidate, followed by a dinner with the Regent Master who had questioned the candidate, constituted the entire examination.[4] "Except praying and drinking, I see nothing else that it is possible to acquire in this place," wrote Jeffrey to a friend in Scotland.[5] Such Oxford remained until the end of the 18th century. Since that time several reforms had been effected. The repute enjoyed by the Scottish universities, the even greater repute of the German universities, and the fall of the old Sorbonne made the continuance of this torpor impossible. In 1800 a system of genuine examinations was organized.[6] After two years at the University the undergraduate who wished to be promoted to the rank of *Sophista generalis* must construe to the satisfaction of a board of examiners

[1] *Autobiography*, chap. iii. ed. 1897, pp. 66–7.
[2] *Works*, ed. Bowring, vol. x. pp. 36 sqq.
[3] Cockburn, *Life of Jeffrey*, vol. i. pp. 35 sqq.
[4] Cox, *Recollections of Oxford*, pp. 35–6.
[5] Cockburn, *Life of Jeffrey*, vol. i. pp. 39–40.
[6] *Statutes*, vol. ii. pp. 29 sqq. See for a summary of the reforms, *A Reply to the Calumnies of the Edinburgh Review*, 1810, by E. Copleston, pp. 138 sqq.; Cox, *Recollections of Oxford*, pp. 45–6. Cf. Charles Lyell, *Travels in North America*, 1845, vol. i. pp. 270 sqq.

whose impartiality was beyond question a passage, no longer made public in advance, from a Greek and a Latin author. And there was a further optional examination in Aldrich's *Manual of Logic* and in Euclid's *Elements*. For the B.A. degree there was an examination at the end of three years in religion, in logic, on Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and *Ethics*, in mathematics. This examination proving too difficult to attract more than four or five candidates a year, new regulations were introduced in 1807,[1] which transformed a qualifying into a classifying examination. Thus established on a definite basis the reform, if we may trust contemporary witness, awoke at Oxford an intellectual ambition hitherto unknown.

To obtain better tutors the colleges were beginning to abolish the public-school monopoly and to open their fellowships to all comers. And to raise the quality of their students they were instituting entrance examinations, and terminal examinations upon the term's work. When Ward visited Oxford he noticed the improved tone of the University. There was less ragging and less drunkenness. He describes the examination, at which he was himself present, of a brilliant scholar, who answered questions for five consecutive hours before a crowded hall. "I regard," he writes, "the institution of these examinations as one of the most important national improvements that has taken place in my time."[2] But before we decide whether this enthusiasm was justified, we must investigate more closely the degree, and above all the real character, of the progress accomplished.

It was not in the very least an improvement in the teaching of science. No doubt mathematics entered into the scheme of the new examinations. But they counted for practically

[1] *Statutes*, vol. ii. pp. 64–5. Candidates were divided into three classes. The first was the class of "honours" men, the second also bestowed the right to be enrolled on the register of the University, and by an additional statute passed in 1809 (*Statutes*, vol. ii. p. 401), the third class was thrown open to all who chose to present themselves, except those, to use the words of a defender of the system, "who displayed an extreme incapacity or an extraordinary lack of scholastic education or had been flagrantly idle during their life at the University."

[2] *Letters to Ivy*, December 27, 1812 (p. 182). Cf. Coleridge, *Biographia Literaria*, 1817, chap. iii. pp. 67–8: "*To those who remember the public schools and universities some twenty years past*, it will appear no ordinary praise in any man to have passed from innocence to virtue, not only free from all vicious habit, but unstained by one act of intemperance or degradations akin to intemperance."

nothing. Pure mathematics alone were concerned and the standard was elementary. In 1815 the thought had occurred to no one of setting up a special board of examiners in mathematics.[1] For the natural sciences there had existed at Oxford since the 18th century public lectures in "experimental philosophy," astronomy, mineralogy and botany, and in 1803 a Chair of Chemistry had been established. But these courses were optional and no examination was attached. Hearers were few or none. Even the Chairs of Medicine had become sinecures. The examinations in this faculty were a pure formality. The same indifference was shown towards the attempts that were made to impart a scientific character to the study of humanity, social or individual. The Faculty of Law might have been utilized for this purpose. But at Oxford the Faculty of Law was no less a sham than the Faculty of Medicine. There was no Chair of Political Economy: the occupant of the recently established Chair of Modern History was expected to throw out passing allusions to the new economic theories. "The best works in political economy," wrote Copleston, the Provost of Oriel, "as well as in the elements of law and politics, are in the hands of many students with the full approbation of those who regulate their studies; although it is never forgotten that to lay a foundation of liberal literature, ancient and modern, before any particular pursuit absorbs the mind is our main business."[2]

The English were a nation of manufacturers and merchants governed by an aristocracy who made it a point of honour to appear ignorant, indeed to be ignorant of the economic foundation on which rested both the national greatness and their own. And it was at Oxford that this aristocracy finished its education. It would have none of a scientific education which it scorned as plebeian and materialist. It demanded an education exclusively classical. And Oxford knew nothing of the methods by which German scholars were transforming the study of the classical texts: the *Edinburgh Review* criticized severely the costly editions issued by the Oxford

[1] *Quarterly Review*, article quoted above (vol. xxxvi. pp. 257–8).
[2] *A Reply to the Calumnies*, . . . p. 154. Cf. the opinions on political economy expressed on p. 172: "However important and even necessary it may be, it is a subordinate and not the predominant concern in public affairs—not less than the management and improvement of an estate in private life is an inferior duty to the education of children, the maintenance of character and the guiding of a house. . . . Its great leading principles, however, are soon acquired; the ordinary reading of the day supplies them."

University Press which were over a century behind the productions of the German school.[1]

Cambridge differed from Oxford. There the college fellowships had never been monopolized by the public schools, and the masters had therefore more liberty to appoint competent tutors. Relations between tutors and pupils were more friendly than at Oxford.[2] Just as the Oxford tradition was Tory, the Cambridge tradition was Whig. The obligation of subscription to the thirty-nine articles had been abolished altogether in 1775 for the undergraduates, and for Bachelors of Arts a formula had been drawn up in language deliberately ambiguous.[3] In 1793 the Jacobinism of the fellows and undergraduates of St. John's College and Trinity College had alarmed the authorities.[4] If Oxford was the stronghold of the High Church, Cambridge, where Milner and Simeon taught and preached, was, as we have seen, a centre of Evangelical activity. This occasioned an inevitable *rapprochement* with Dissent. The Baptist preacher Robert Hall attracted to his chapel not only the normal meeting-house congregation—shopkeepers, farmers and artisans—but a large number of members of the University, both tutors and undergraduates.[5] In 1809 the Duke of Grafton, Chancellor Elect of the University, openly attended in London the Unitarian chapel in Essex Street.[6] For the past thirty years Cambridge had been distinguished by its zeal for the abolition of the slave trade.[7] Nothing of the kind would have been possible at Oxford.

And we must remark another important difference. At the end of the 17th century, when Newton was making the discoveries to which he owes his renown, Cambridge had established the examination known as the mathematical

[1] *Edinburgh Review*, July 1809, No. 28, Art. 10, *The Oxford Edition of Strabo* (vol. xiv. pp. 429 sqq.).

[2] Peacock, *Life of Young*, p. 120; C. Wordsworth, *Annals of my Early Life*, pp. 35 sqq.

[3] C. H. Cooper, *Annals of Cambridge*, vol. iv. pp. 336, 390.

[4] For the episode of Frend's expulsion see Gunning, *Reminiscenses of Cambridge*, vol. i. pp. 280 sqq.

[5] O. Gregory, *A Brief Memoir of the Life of Robert Hall*, pp. 111–12.

[6] Campbell, *Lives of the Chancellors*, vol. vii. p. 234. "The King said . . . 'it would be hard if Cambridge had a Unitarian Chancellor and Oxford a Popish one.'"

[7] Clarkson, *Abolition of the Slave Trade*, vol. i. pp. 203 sqq., 456–7. In 1818 a Dissenter was on the point of occupying a Chair at Cambridge. *Quarterly Review*, July 1818, Art. 10; *Cambridge Botanical Professorship* (vol. xix. pp. 434 sqq.).

tripos. Cambridge therefore had possessed for over a century a system of genuine examinations, and a system whose character was distinctively scientific and modern.

The lectures in physics, chemistry and anatomy were better attended than at Oxford.[1] Clarke, who had occupied since 1803 the new Professorship of Mineralogy, was a scientist of distinction.[2] For the past twenty years Farish had been lecturing on chemistry and applied mechanics to audiences which approached a hundred. For his practical work and his demonstrations he had at his disposal a fine laboratory equipped with a steam engine.[3] While Oxford, faithful to the scholastic tradition, was teaching Aristotle's *Logic* and *Ethics*, Aristotle was unknown at Cambridge. Newton's *Principia*, and in philosophy Locke's *Essay* and the works of Paley, were the foundation of the Cambridge course. And candidates were examined not only on Locke and Paley, but on Hume, Butler, Clarke, and Hartley.[4] No systematic courses were yet given in political economy; but the deficiency had for many years been keenly felt by many tutors. Paley had introduced lectures on political economy into his course of moral philosophy. In 1799 Ingram had demanded the institution of a Professorship in Economics,[5] and his desire was to be fulfilled in 1816. And the scientific character of the education given at Cambridge was apparent even in classics and theology. Porson, who had died in 1809, had been one of the greatest Hellenists in Europe. Marsh, the foe of the Bible Societies, was the only member of the Church of England who attempted to apply to the Bible the methods of German criticism. If further evidence be desired of the spirit of scientific rationalism which prevailed at Cambridge, here is a conclusive, if external, proof. The critics of the *Edinburgh Review*, whose attacks upon the University of Oxford were so unsparing, treated the sister University with indulgence or passed it over in silence; and silence is a species of indulgence. But when all has been said, we must admit that the methods

[1] *Quarterly Review*, article quoted above (vol. xxxvi. p. 263).

[2] G. Dyer, *History of the University of Cambridge*, 1814, vol. i. p. 216.

[3] *Life of William Allen*, vol. i. p. 77. See the interesting conspectus of his course published by Farish under the title *A Plan of a Course of Lectures on Arts and Manufactures, more particularly such as relate to Chemistry*, 1st ed., 1796.

[4] *Cambridge University Calendar* for the year 1814, p. 259.

[5] G. Dyer, *History of the University of Cambridge*, 1814, vol. i. p. 220.

employed at Cambridge in teaching natural science were in many respects open to complaint, and invited criticisms of a similar nature to the criticisms that were urged against the methods of contemporary Oxford. As at Oxford, the courses in science were optional. A series of unassuming lectures delivered to an audience whose attendance was not compulsory, they were elementary in the extreme. Newton's chair was occupied by a theologian, Milner, and Gunning in his witty and entertaining *Reminiscences of Cambridge* describes his lectures in optics as mere "exhibitions of the magic lanthorn."[1] Moreover, the teaching of mathematics was submitted to a traditional routine. A Newtonian scholasticism reigned at Cambridge as the Aristotelian scholasticism at Oxford.[2] All the progress effected since Newton in the study of the differential and integral calculus was deliberately ignored, and the antiquated method of fluxions obstinately maintained. Few Englishmen, therefore, were capable even of understanding the great works of the contemporary French mathematicians. Astronomical mechanics and mathematical physics were alike unknown at Cambridge. And the ignorance of Cambridge hindered the development of these branches of science throughout the whole of England.

To sum up, the University of Oxford, although important reforms had been made in the methods of study, was exclusively literary and classical and despised or ignored the sciences. The University of Cambridge, where the intellectual interest had always been more serious, had indeed been affected by the modern developments in natural science, but could not be considered in any degree the home of active scientific research. Both Universities were suffering from a radical evil common to both alike, and due to the composition of their student body. No doubt at Cambridge, and even at Oxford, there had been for many years past an élite who worked hard, who even at times overworked themselves to prepare for an examination.[3] But the great mass of undergraduates were deliberately idle.

[1] Gunning, *Reminiscences of Cambridge*, vol. i. p. 259.

[2] For this Newtonian idolatry and its effects, see *Edinburgh Review*, January 1808, p. 22 n., Art. 1, La Place, *Traité de Mécanique céleste* (vol. xi. pp. 249 sqq.); also Peacock, *Life of Young*, p. 186.

[3] See the favourable account of Cambridge which, in 1811, John Campbell, the future Lord Campbell, wrote to his father (*Life of John, Lord Campbell*, vol. i. p. 265). The testimony of a Scotsman is above suspicion. Cf. Lyell, *Travels in North America*, 1845, vol. i. pp. 286–7.

Neither University educated doctors; and barristers learnt their profession in London. If future doctors and barristers spent a short period at Oxford or Cambridge, it was either under the compulsion of the rules of their profession or because it was the correct thing to do from the social standpoint, and the body of which they hoped to be members was aristocratic. All candidates for Ordination passed through the University. But as we have seen, the national Church in England made no claim to be intellectual. The vast majority of undergraduates were drawn from the nobility and gentry[1]. The ambition of the ablest was to play a part in the political and parliamentary life of the country. These men asked from their teachers a sufficient stock of philosophic and historical commonplaces, a few tricks of oratory, and some reminiscences of the classics. And they wanted nothing further. For the rest the University was entirely and exclusively a club of young men who had come up on leaving their public schools to learn the art of spending money. During the seven months of term the wealthiest could spend several thousands. It was difficult to live in a town where these rich spendthrifts set the fashion, under £100 to £150 a year.[2] The poor student was condemned to a precarious and humiliating existence in an environment necessarily unfavourable to serious study. We can now appreciate the reason of the immense social importance of Oxford and Cambridge, the reason also why their social importance was so disproportionate to their scientific. Were there perhaps outside the Universities other institutions that could be relied upon to further the progress of science?

Other Scientific Bodies.

The Royal College of Physicians of London, a sixteenth-century foundation, possessed both the authority and the duty to organize and control in London the teaching of

[1] This accounts for their small number, 3,000 between Oxford and Cambridge in 1827, according to Lyell's estimate (*Quarterly Review*, vol. xxxvi. p. 240), as against 4,000 at the Scottish Universities. But Lyell adds that the number of students at the two English Universities "has greatly increased of late." Ward (*Letters to Ivy*, December 27, 1812, p. 183) reckons for Oxford "700 to 800 young people . . . including the representatives of at least half the great families in the Kingdom."

[2] Our figure is a mean between the figure given by Huber for the 18th century (*The English Universities*, vol. ii. pp. 329 sqq.) and the figure given by his translator, Fr. Newman, for 1843 (*ibid.*, p. 230 n.).

medicine, and in this way to further the progress of the biological sciences. It had been founded by Henry VIII at the advice of his court physician, Linacre, to protect the public from quacks by the establishment of what we may term a supreme council of the profession. Eight *electi* chosen by co-optation and themselves appointing an annual president had been charged with the supervision of the London doctors who constituted the associates, the *socii*. With the process of time the constitution of the college became increasingly elaborate and hierarchic. It now consisted of a treasurer, a keeper of the archives, a librarian, and a bedel, not to mention the four censors elected annually. As a weapon against the increasing competition of Scottish doctors, it had been decided that no one should be admitted as an associate who had not taken a degree at Oxford or Cambridge. For the others, whose professional merit could not be ignored a subordinate rank had been created in the hierarchy of the profession, the rank of *permissi* or licentiates. And occasional attempts were made to compel candidates for the rank of licentiate to spend two months at Oxford or Cambridge. The total number of members amounted to fifty associates and fifty licentiates.

Undeniably this policy of exclusion raised the standing of the profession. London doctors could accumulate enormous fortunes. We hear of a doctor about 1815 who made over £20,000 a year.[1] The standing of the medical profession was perhaps slightly inferior to the standing of the two other liberal professions.[2] Members of noble families did not enter it, nor could any doctor obtain a peerage. On the other hand, no Dissenter could become an associate, since only members of the Church of England could take a degree at Oxford or Cambridge. During his years at the University an associate had mixed with the future dignitaries of Church

[1] According to Laetitia Hawkins (*Anecdotes*, vol. i., 1822, p. 249), £8,000 a year was regarded as a very large income for a doctor at the close of the 18th century. When she wrote it was said that one doctor in London was making £22,000.

[2] Beddoes, *A Letter to Sir Joseph Banks on the . . . Discontents . . . in Medicine*, 1808, summarized by Stock, *Memoir of . . . Beddoes*, p. 375: "Hence . . . has arisen the marked distinction between the three liberal professions . . . that while honours and distinctions await eminence or influence in the other two, the votary of medicine is considered as, of necessity, excluded from every public honour." The distinction was apparently still more marked in Ireland. Wakefield, *Ireland*, vol. ii. p. 785: "It is extraordinary that medical men in Ireland are not held in the same estimation as gentlemen of the other liberal professions."

and State, the members of the ruling class. Once established in London he belonged to their world. He might aspire to a knighthood, even to a baronetcy. Of all the countries of Europe England at the opening of the 19th century was the country where the prestige of the medical profession stood highest.

The Royal College of Physicians with its hundred members was obviously incapable of providing all the necessary doctors even for London, not to speak of the provinces. The deficiency of official "physicians" was supplied by the surgeons, members of a subordinate corporation. They possessed their Royal College[1] established in 1800, which was governed by a Court of Assistants, a council of twenty-three inclusive of the Master and two Governors. No one could be admitted to the Royal College of Physicians of London and retain his membership of the Royal College of Surgeons of England. This regulation delineated the respective status of the two bodies. And the surgeons in turn excluded from their Court of Assistants any surgeon who in addition to the exercise of his profession was an *accoucheur* or a chemist. Nevertheless, the chemists, or apothecaries, as they were termed though they were relegated thus to the lowest degree in the medical hierarchy, and although no professional qualification was required for the practice of their trade, played a very important part in English life. For the provision of surgeons was as inadequate as the provision of physicians. In country districts the treatment of the sick was abandoned almost entirely to the chemist.[2] In the towns and even in London the period was not yet distant when doctors never saw the majority of their patients, and were satisfied with a consultation with the apothecary who sought his advice for serious cases. And the apothecary was still the ordinary medical adviser of the family; it was only when the illness had become dangerous that the doctor was summoned on the advice of the druggist.[3] In the medical profession the apothecary

[1] Simon, *English Sanitary Institutions*, p. 69.

[2] *General Report of Commissioners on the Universities and Colleges of Scotland*, 1831, p. 66: ". . . under this denomination are included nine-tenths of the country practitioners in England. It is only in large towns, and probably rarely even in them, that the different departments of the Physician, Surgeon and Apothecary are kept separate."

[3] And the doctor's function was still almost exclusively diagnosis. Smiles, *Murray*, vol. i. pp. 53–4, I. D'Israeli to John Murray, May 31, 1806: "Most warmly I must impress on your mind the necessity of taking the advice of a physician. . . . I should imagine that one or two visits will be sufficient to receive some definite

bore the same relation to the doctor as, in the law, the attorney bore to the barrister. And just as many famous barristers had received their legal education in the office of an attorney, so many celebrated doctors had begun their medical career in a chemist's shop.

Thus the first effect of organizing the medical profession as a close corporation was to place the vast majority of patients at the mercy of ignorant practitioners. Nor did the system compensate for this unfortunate result by raising the standard of medical knowledge among the members of the Royal College. If among the doctors of Europe the English were the most respected, they were far from being the most learned.

The Scottish universities, and Edinburgh in particular, possessed a medical faculty which enjoyed a high reputation. But the Royal College of London made entrance into the profession difficult alike for the Scotsmen who had studied in these universities and for any Englishman who might desire to do so. At Oxford and Cambridge, at which a long period of attendance was made compulsory by the rules of the Royal College,[1] a medical faculty was for all practical purposes non-existent, the lectures mere displays of oratory, the examinations a farce. And the Royal College of Physicians did nothing, or almost nothing, to supply this lack of medical teaching at the two Universities. At intervals of about twenty years it published a *Pharmacopœia.* In its *Medical Transactions* it printed communications from members. A museum, the Harveian, and a fairly extensive library were attached to the College. And a certain number of lectures which bore the names of their founders—the "Lumleian Lecture," the "Gulstonian Lecture," the "Croonian Lecture," the "Harveian Oration"—were given at regular intervals. The Royal College of Surgeons also possessed its museum, equipped by John Hunter at his private expense, published communications dealing with anatomy and surgery, and gave an annual course of twenty-four lectures. But all these lectures were mere adademic displays, of an oratorical rather than a scientific nature. This was the case even when the rules of the foundation prescribed that the lecture should be accompanied by a dissection. When all

---

notion of your complaint. . . . The expense of a physician is moderate, if the patient is shrewd and sensible. Five or ten pounds this way would be a good deal."

[1] For these rules, see Peacock, *Life of Young*, p. 120 sqq.

is said, it is evident that the two colleges were exclusive and reactionary corporations in close alliance with Oxford and Cambridge, not for the encouragement but, on the contrary, for the obstruction of scientific progress.

Was nothing, then, done in London to improve medical training? We have not yet examined the management of the hospitals; and it is precisely this examination which will bring home the difficulty of determining for a particular point of time the condition of a social institution in a state of continual change. In the early years of the 19th century the professional tradition in England still declared it beneath the dignity of a doctor of any position to be seen at a hospital. The staff attached to the hospital visited the wards barely once a week. The daily medical work was done by apothecaries. Very few medical students received their training in the hospitals. The right to attend the doctor as a physician's pupil cost about sixteen guineas a term.[1] Salaried posts were obtained by favour or purchase.[2] The rough and ready fashion in which operations were performed, and the almost total absence of accurate observations and records, were a source of frequent complaint. These abuses were of long standing. Nevertheless, they were universally condemned and reform had begun. But the reform was the work of forces entirely foreign to the College of Physicians and the College of Surgeons.

Modern humanitarianism was multiplying the London hospitals. Sir Thomas Bernard, a friend of Wilberforce and a man of vast wealth, spent his energy and devotion in the reform of the great orphanage in the north of London, the Foundlings' Hospital. By the opening year of the new century the necessity of special hospitals for infectious diseases had been realized; and the example given by their foundation in London had been followed immediately by Manchester and Liverpool. The Society for the Improvement of the Condition of the Poor, the joint foundation of Sir Thomas Bernard, Wilberforce and the Bishop of Durham, was struggling to make the system universal. Between 1800 and 1815 London witnessed the foundation of a Cancer Hospital, two ophthalmic clinics, two societies for the free treatment of hernia, a large number of dispensaries. The propaganda in favour of vaccination dated from 1799. In

[1] *Life of Sir Robert Christison*, vol. i. pp. 189 sqq., 190–1, 193, 194. Cf. *Journal of a Tour . . . by a French Traveller*, 1815, vol. i. pp. 76–7.

[2] Clarke, *Autobiographical Recollections*, p. 314.

1806 for the first time a week passed without a single death in London from smallpox. And obviously the philanthropists who founded hospitals would see that their condition left nothing to be desired, that the administration was conscientious and scientific.

During the closing years of the 18th century two celebrated doctors, Heberden and Abernethy, inaugurated a system of practical training for medical and surgical students in the operating theatres of the hospitals.[1] Nor was this all. In the neighbourhood of the hospitals which were institutions for free treatment, governed by trustees and managed by committees of noblemen, gentlemen and wealthy members of the middle class, there sprang up a considerable number of private medical schools which proved very successful. In these medical students were taught for a fee the knowledge of their profession. The most celebrated of these schools was the school in Great Windmill Street, off Piccadilly.[2] Thus did unofficial England, the initiative of the individual or, more strictly speaking, of the private and voluntary association, supply the deficiencies of the official corporations, and compel those ancient bodies to adapt themselves to modern conditions. In 1815 after a struggle continued for three years, the apothecaries obtained the legal regulation of their trade and the institution of qualifying examinations.[3] England now possessed a guarantee that in the near future the practice of medicine would no longer be divided between an oligarchy too exclusive and too confident of its privileges to be industrious, and a proletariate of practitioners who offered their patients no proof of the necessary scientific equipment.

Of all the sciences we can discover one, and one alone, towards which the British Government appeared to admit a duty of official patronage. A venerable tradition, dating, perhaps, from the period of judicial astrology, placed astronomy under royal protection. Moreover, the needs of navigation, more urgent in England than in any other country, necessitated the careful observation of the planets and stars,

[1] George Macilwain, *Memoirs of Abernethy*, pp. 39–40; Perceval *Medical Ethics*, pp. 204–5, letter from W. Heberden to Dr. Perceval, October 15, 1794.

[2] Clarke, *Autobiographical Recollections*, pp. 8, 9.

[3] 55 Geo. III, cap. 195. For the Apothecaries' Act, its results and the circumstances which led to its passage, see Clarke, *Autobiographical Recollections*, pp. 5 sqq.; *Life of William Allen*, vol. i. p. 163; H. of C., March 26, 1813, November 19, 1813; H. of L., July 10, 1815 (*Parl. Deb.*, vol. xxv. pp. 349 sqq.; vol. xxvii. pp. 164–5; vol. xxxi. p. 1143).

of the tides, of the variation of the compass. The 18th century had produced a host of inventors who successively improved the instruments for their observation and measurement. The labours of George Graham, John Bird, Edward Troughton, and the long line of Dollands had facilitated astronomical research, and had bestowed on British astronomy its distinctive character as a science of observation rather than a branch of mathematics. William Herschel was, after all, only the greatest of these instrument makers. It was by constructing without assistance or pecuniary resources telescopes sufficiently powerful to discover a new planet, that he attracted the attention of King George and earned his pension from the Government. Private observatories were numerous in England. Observatories were attached to the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge and Dublin. The East India Company had constructed them at Madras, Bombay, and St. Helena. Thus had been created a favourable environment for astronomical research. The Royal Observatory founded in 1675, eight years after the Paris Observatory, and distinguished successively by the presence of Halley, Bradley and Maskelyne, benefited by the interest in astronomy. When in 1811 Pond had succeeded Maskelyne as Astronomer Royal, the salary attached to the position had been raised to £600. He renewed the equipment of the observatory and increased the number of his assistants. Greenwich Observatory was a model Government "laboratory," whose superiority was recognized throughout Europe. Arago would visit Greenwich to study Pond's methods. But what the British Government did for astronomy, it did not do for physics, chemistry or any other branch of natural science.

Nevertheless, England possessed a scientific academy of world-wide repute. The Royal Society of London for Improving Natural Knowledge, a corporation equipped with special privileges and already more than a century old, would appear to have increased its prestige in the scientific world since the accession to the presidency of Sir Joseph Banks, the explorer and botanist, a scientist of distinction, and even more distinguished as a patron of science, a man of good birth, a great landowner, with a wide acquaintance among the aristocracy. To the general satisfaction he made use of the despotic power which he asserted over the officers of the society to maintain a prudent numerical balance between the members who were actually men of science and the aristocrats and bankers who threatened to swamp the society. Through the society his influence made itself felt upon other scientific institutions. He controlled Greenwich

Observatory, was consulted as a matter of course about the appointment of the Astronomer Royal, and was a trustee of the British Museum, an enormous storehouse where since 1753 rare books and antiquities of every description had accumulated in disorder. In 1818 he would secure for the Royal Society three permanent seats on the newly constituted Office of Longitudes, and it would be understood that their choice was in his hands. And he wore his presidency in princely fashion, entertained lavishly, even magnificently, at his mansion in Soho Square, kept open house once a week. But whatever the social standing of the society under the presidency of Banks, however useful its functions, it had not been founded for research or education. It was neither a laboratory nor a school. The *Transactions* and the great annual lectures, the *Croonian Lecture* and the *Bakerian Lecture*, provided scientists whose position was recognized an opportunity to publish their latest discoveries. The Royal Society was an admirable instrument for the registration o the progress already accomplished. It would make no direct contribution to its accomplishment.

And the progress made was in fact so rapid that the Royal Society was no longer adequate even to its registration. A host of new societies sprang up around it. We are not speaking of the Royal Society of Edinburgh or of the Royal Irish Academy, both already thirty years old. These two foundations were merely a proof that Scotland and Ireland made it a point of national honour to possess their own scientific academies. We refer to the societies which were being founded in London itself to satisfy the needs of the specialist and assist detailed observations on a large scale. The Linnæan Society, founded in 1788, had received its charter of incorporation in 1802. The Royal Society, its founders explained, by the very fact that its scope embraced every branch of science, could not cope with the minutiæ of Natural History. An institution such as they were founding was indispensable, if the world was to reap the fruits of the toil and expenditure of collectors, the experience of cultivators, the notes of observers.[1] The Geological Society dated from 1807. At that period the public were disgusted by the disputes between the followers of Werner and the followers of Hutton, battles in the clouds remote from solid facts. And William Smith, without guidance or assistance, was accumulating a wealth of discoveries about the geological formations of Britain. The founders of the Geological Society obeying the motive which inspired the work of Smith, renounced provisionally

[1] Weld, *History of Royal Society*, vol. ii. p. 198.

geological theory and adopted as their exclusive object the collection and publication of the greatest possible number of observations. The Zoological Society, the Horticultural Society, the Medico-Surgical Society, the Society for Animal Chemistry, the Astronomical Society sprang up in rapid succession during these years. Occasionally these new foundations enjoyed the entire approbation of the Royal Society.[1] But more often Sir Joseph Banks took alarm. "I see plainly," he told a friend, "that all these new-fangled associations will finally dismantle the Royal Society and not leave the old lady a rag to cover her."[2] And the Royal Society was in fact swamped by the vast activities which were being carried on around her. How is this outburst of activity to be explained? What was its origin and its cause? In Scotland, whether we consider the system of primary education or the universities, the action of a Government inspired by the Protestantism of the national Church is evident. But it was not only in Scotland, it was in England also, that for the past fifty years discovery had followed upon discovery. And with rare exceptions the English Government adopted towards Science an attitude of absolute and impenetrable apathy. It is in Nonconformist England, the England excluded from the national universities, in industrial England with its new centres of population and civilization, that we must seek the institutions which gave birth to the utilitarian and scientific culture of the new era. That culture spread and made its way into the old England of the aristocracy, and even into the Universities. But its birth was elsewhere. The thesis of historical materialism, dubious in its universal application, is to this extent true of England at the opening of the 19th century. Scientific theory was the

[1] Bence Jones, *The Royal Institution*, p. 261, Sir Joseph Banks' letter to Rumford, April 1804.

[2] Barrow, *Sketches of the Royal Society*, p. 10. Sometimes he made terms with the enemy. In 1809 he obtained the affiliation to the Royal Society of the Society for Animal Chemistry as an assistant society. In recompense for the renunciation of her absolute monarchy over the scientific world the Royal Society would exercise in this way a species of suzerainty over the other Societies. But the plan did not secure general adoption. The Geological Society refused to follow the example of the Society for Animal Chemistry and preserved entire autonomy (Weld, *History of Royal Society*, vol. ii. pp. 237 sqq., 243; Woodward, *History of Geological Society*, pp. 25 sqq.). According to F. Galton (*Biometrika*, October 1901, vol. i. p. 9), the Geological Society owed its foundation to a deliberate revolt against the autocracy of Sir Joseph Banks.

offspring of industrial practice. The emotional piety of Evangelical religion and the hunger for experimental knowledge developed at the same time, with the same intensity, and in the same social *milieu*.

VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATION OF SCIENTIFIC ACTIVITY. NATURAL SCIENCE. POLITICAL ECONOMY. THE UTILITARIAN PHILOSOPHY

The Popular "Library" and "University."

Books were the medium in which the education of the middle class was generated, in a sense, spontaneously. For half a century past the literature of science had been daily enriched by new publications—some more technical, others more popular—adapted thus to the needs of different classes of readers.

The *Encyclopædia Britannica*, planned on the model of the *Encyclopédie* of Diderot and D'Alembert, had passed through five editions since 1771. The first had been in three volumes—the fifth, a quite recent publication, consisted of twenty. And the publisher, Constable, was arranging for an enormous supplement to be written by the most eminent authorities of the day—a collection of scholarly articles designed to present a complete picture of the state of human knowledge about the year 1815. The venerable *Cyclopædia* of Chambers, which had once served as the model of the French *Encyclopédie*, had also passed through several editions. Abraham Rees, after revising it for the first time in 1778, had just undertaken at Longman's invitation a new edition, which would begin to appear in 1819 and would comprise thirty-nine volumes.

In addition to these works of general information numerous periodicals issued yearly and even monthly kept the public in touch with the progress of science. Nicholson's *Journal* had begun to appear in 1797,[1] Thomson the chemist had just founded the *Annals of Philosophy*.[2] The *Repertory of Arts, Manufactures and Agriculture*, the *Retrospect of Philosophical, Mechanical, Chemical and Agricultural Discoveries* were two publications of an inferior type, confined to a list of the

[1] Full title, *A Journal of Natural Philosophy, Chemistry and other Arts.*

[2] *Annals of Philosophy; or Magazine of Chemistry, Mineralogy, Mechanics, Natural History, Agriculture, and the Arts*, vol. i. January to June, 1813.

latest patents, and excerpts from English or French scientific publications. Tilloch's *Philosophical Magazine* aimed at combining amusement with instruction, a combination effected far more completely by the *Repository of Arts, Literature, Manufactures, Fashion and Politics*. Science for the people was an established type of literature.

We could not, however, explain fully the success achieved by these publications, if we failed to take into consideration the innumerable institutions founded to assist their circulation. The establishment of lending libraries had enabled their subscribers to read a large number of books which they could not have purchased privately. And if the circulating libraries were shops managed by shopkeepers which supplied trashy fiction, the book clubs on the contrary were organized by bodies of disinterested people, whose aim was the acquisition of good books and useful knowledge.[1] Few towns large or small were without a book club. In important centres, such as Liverpool, the organization of the lending libraries was almost perfect. The Athenæum with its 8,000 volumes had been founded by a subscription, which brought in on one day £4,000. Five hundred "proprietors" paid a yearly subscription of two and a half guineas for the use of the library. The Lyceum in the same city, with its 11,000 volumes, had cost the original subscribers £11,000: its books could be borrowed for an annual subscription of half a guinea.[2] Since the book trade had made such enormous strides, why should not libraries finally take the place which Universities had taken at a period when books were few and speech was the normal method by which men exchanged thoughts? But libraries suffer from one radical defect. They cannot be centres of original research, laboratories. And in spite of the multiplication of printed matter man feels an irrepressible impulse to communicate his thoughts by word of mouth. To satisfy needs which libraries are incapable of satisfying institutions of a novel type sprang up in the provinces.

At Manchester first, the centre of the cotton industry, a species of local academy, a literary and scientific club, was founded. The foundation was due to the Liberal Dissenters, the members of the Warrington Academy, which had just been transferred to Manchester. Among their number was the doctor and philanthropist Perceval. The Literary and Philosophical Society assumed its permanent shape in 1781,

[1] See for the organization of the book clubs, *The Critic*, April 7, 1860, p. 435.

[2] R. Ayton, *Voyage round Great Britain* (1815), p. 85.

and founded at the same time the College of Arts and Sciences. In the College lectures were given on "applied mechanics, and the principal branches of physics," on "chemistry considered in its relation to arts and manufactures," on "the origin, history and progress of the arts and manufactures and of commerce, on commercial law and the regulation of trade in different countries, commutative justice, and other branches of commercial morality." The object of the Institution was the education of young men between their departure from school and their entrance into business. Every lecturer was paid by his class. After two winter sessions the College failed. But the Society survived and began in 1785 the publication of its *Memorials*. It rose to fame when Dalton began to communicate to it the results of his experiments.

The son of a Westmorland peasant, Dalton had been in succession monitor in an elementary school, schoolmaster and professor of mathematics in the College of Arts and Sciences. Since the College had been closed his sole source of livelihood had been the private tuition he gave in Manchester, and the lectures he delivered in the neighbourhood. The Literary and Philosophical Society furnished him with a laboratory. The instruments at his disposal were of a poor quality and he was an impatient and careless experimenter. But the combination of inadequate apparatus, and merely approximate results enabled him in many cases to blame his instrument for the discrepancy between the results actually reached and the demands of the hypotheses which he was seeking to verify. For his genius lay in the formulation of brilliant hypotheses. He was born, to employ the language of his biographer, to be "the lawgiver of chemistry"; and the boldness of his hypotheses was rewarded by their success.

The investigation of certain meteorological problems led Dalton to the study of vapours, his study of vapours to the study of gases. Alone or in collaboration with Dr. Henry, a Manchester physician, and a translator of Lavoisier, who had introduced into Lancashire new chemical processes for bleaching cloth, he determined the fundamental laws which govern the liquefaction of gases and their mutual combinations. Faithful to the Newtonian tradition, he regarded gases as composed of particles, molecules or atoms. Would not this hypothesis which explained the combination of gases explain also their chemical composition? In 1802 Dalton discovered that marsh gas and olefiant oil contain for the same quantity of hydrogen, quantities of carbon, one of which is an exact multiple of the other. This would

be explained quite simply, if the carbon and the hydrogen were composed of atoms which could unite in the proportion of one to one, one to two, one to three, etc., but could not unite in any intermediate ratio, since the atom is indivisible. Thus were introduced simultaneously into chemistry the law of combination in multiple proportions and the atomic theory, and with these the possibility of prediction. Given knowledge of the relative weight of "the ultimate particles" or "atoms" which composed the structure of a particular body, it would be possible to predict, if not the properties, at least the constitution of an entire series of compounds of which the same simple substances were constituent elements.[1]

In 1804 Dalton explained his system in London. His success was slight. But that same year he was visited at Manchester by the chemist Thomas Thomson, professor at Edinburgh University. Thomson had made no original discoveries, and was not therefore prejudiced against Dalton's hypotheses by any preconceived theories. He was a professor who had just published a bulky textbook of chemistry in four volumes, whose avowed aim was to make a stand against the exaggerated deference paid to the French school of chemistry and to rehabilitate the reputation of English chemistry.[2] Thomson was, therefore, disposed to give a sympathetic hearing to the novel theories of his compatriot. Critics charged Thomson with an excessive fondness for speculations on the constitution of matter.[3] This common trait was a further bond between himself and Dalton. The atomic theory won his immediate and enthusiastic adhesion.

It was no doubt at Thomson's invitation that Dalton in 1807 propounded his theory in public lectures at Edinburgh and Glasgow. And in the third edition of his *System of Chemistry*, which appeared the same year, Thomson explained Dalton's theory, though it was as yet unpublished.[4] The same year, at a dinner of the Royal Society Club, Thom-

[1] See the account of Dalton's theories by himself, *A New System of Chemical Philosophy*, Part 1, chap. iii., *On Chemical Synthesis*, p. 211.

[2] *A System of Chemistry*, 1st ed., 1802, vol. i, pp. 8 sqq.

[3] *Edinburgh Review*, April 1804, No. 7, Art. 9, *Dr. Thomson's System of Chemistry*, vol. iv, p. 142.

[4] Vol. iii. p. 424: "Though the author has not yet thought fit to publish his hypothesis, yet, as the notions of which it consists are original and extremely interesting, and as they are intimately connected with some of the most intricate parts of the doctrine of affinity, I have ventured, with Mr. Dalton's permission, to enrich this work with a short sketch of it."

son attempted to make the scientists of London understand its importance. He succeeded in convincing Wollaston, a chemist as careful in his experiments as Dalton was bold in the framing of hypotheses. Wollaston, by his proof that the law of multiple proportions was applicable to salts as well as to acids and alkalis, brought a valuable piece of evidence to confirm the Daltonian hypothesis.[1] In France Gay-Lussac accepted Dalton's law and completed it by his law of volumes. Berzelius devised a system of abbreviated notation to express the multiple proportions. As Lavoisier had built a theoretical system out of Priestley's experiments, so Dalton in turn gave a more rigorously scientific form to the theories of Lavoisier and his followers. Priestley was a Unitarian, Dalton a Quaker. Both belonged to the provinces, and moreover to the manufacturing districts in the Centre and North of England. These facts show the importance of the part played in the formation of modern chemistry by the union between the Protestant tradition and the new industry.

Other provincial towns followed the example of Manchester. Birmingham possessed a Philosophical Society, founded in 1800 and occupying freehold premises since 1813.[2] It existed for the study of "natural philosophy, moral philosophy, political economy, and æsthetics." Lectures were delivered on mechanics, chemistry, mineralogy, and metallurgy. At Newcastle there was a Literary and Philosophical Society[3] to which George Stephenson sent his son Robert to receive a scientific education, by watching the experiments and hearing the discussions, at a cost of three guineas per annum.[4] At Bristol Dr. Beddoes, expelled from Oxford in 1792 for "Jacobinism," founded his "Pneumatic Institute" to cure disease by the inhalation of gas. He would have liked to complete it by a large educational establishment; but lack of funds compelled him to be satisfied with arranging courses of lectures at the Institute itself. The middle class public

[1] See Thomas Thomson's communication of January 14, 1808, on Oxalic Acid, and W. H. Wollaston's of January 28, 1808, on Super-Acid and Sub-Acid salts form a connected whole, and their common object is the confirmation of the Daltonian theory (*Phil. Trans.*, 1808, pp. 63, 96). For a complete history of the progress of the atomic theory, see Thomas Thomson, *History of Chemistry*, vol. ii. pp. 285 sqq.

[2] Langford, *A Century of Birmingham Life*, vol. ii. p. 369.

[3] Holmes, *Coal Mines of Durham and Northumberland*, 1816, p. 184.

[4] Smiles, *Life of Stephenson*, 5th ed., 1858, pp. 56, 57.

flocked to the lectures. Of these courses some were popular presentations of scientific results; but others presented a more ambitious character. There were anatomical lectures by the local surgeons, and lectures on chemistry by Dr. Beddoes himself.[1] A publication entitled "Contributions to Physical and Medical Knowledge, principally from the West of England," was a periodical register of the experiments. Beddoes' assistant in the management of the institute was a young Cornish Methodist of humble origin named Humphry Davy. Under Beddoes, Davy completed his scientific training and he published his earliest work in the *Contributions*.

From the University standpoint London was merely a large provincial town. Scientific education could be organized in London only by the methods employed at Birmingham or Manchester. Bentham and his friends thought of making use of the Lancastrian association to establish an institute for secondary education, at which mathematics, modern languages, politics and ethics would be taught, and the children of middle-class parents provided with the scientific education at present out of their reach.[2] The project failed, and many years were to elapse before the Benthamites would succeed in providing the Metropolis with a genuine university. Meanwhile what provision was made for a Londoner of the middle class who wished to educate himself?

Subscription lectures were multiplied. Not only were courses of medicine and anatomy given in the operating theatres of hospitals, but even courses of physics and chemistry.[3] In 1802 William Allen had lectured on chemistry to audiences of 120.[4] And more systematic organizations were formed whose exclusive object was the provision of popular lectures on science. In January 1815 the Surrey Institute announced the opening of a course by Mr. John Mason Good "on the passions and affections of the mind, their connexion with the organization of the body and their influence on savage and civilized life."[5] At the Russell Institu-

[1] Stock, *Memoir of Beddoes*, pp. 136, 144–5.
[2] See my *Formation du Radicalisme Philosophique*, vol. ii. p. 256.
[3] *Life of Sir Astley Cooper*, vol. i. p. 236.
[4] *Life of William Allen*, vol. i. p. 61. Cf. pp. 2, 62, 73; and on the same page (73) we read: "About this period (1804) W. Allen attended a series of conversations at Dr. Babington's, where Count Bournon gave instruction in mineralogy, particularly crystallography."
[5] *Morning Chronicle*, January 2, 1815. For the Surrey Institution, see Stock, *Memoir of Beddoes*, p. 335.

tion in Russell Square Mr. Singer delivered a course of lectures on electricity and electro-chemistry at a charge of £1 11s. 6d. to those who were not members of the Institution, of £1 4s. to annual subscribers.[1] Mr. Walker delivered at the Paul's Head, Cateaton Street, his Annual City Course of Philosophy at a charge of a guinea for a course of twelve lectures, or 2s. 6d. a lecture.[2] In 1816 Michael Faraday, a Nonconformist with mystical tendencies, gave six lectures at the City Philosophical Society on "the attraction of cohesion, on radiant matter, on diverse simple bodies." It was at this very Society, which had been founded in 1808 for their mutual education by forty young men of modest origin, that Faraday had begun his scientific studies only three years earlier when a humble apprentice to a bookseller.[3] The Askesian Society had been founded in 1796 by a band of young men who wished to work in co-operation. The Society met at Plough Court, the home of the Quaker philanthropist William Allen, who placed the apparatus of his chemical factory at the disposal of the members for use in their experimental work;[4] for with the owner's consent any factory could be made in a day into an excellent laboratory. The London Institution, founded in 1805 by voluntary subscription, possessed a very extensive library, a lecture hall and a reading-room.[5] And finally, there was the Royal Institution, with its luxuriously furnished premises in Albemarle Street, in the centre of fashionable London. Among the scientific foundations of London the Institution occupies a place apart; for here, we have left behind us the type of institution with which we have been lately engaged and are in the neighbourhood of the Royal Society. Insensibly we exchange the company of the middle-class worker for the society of noblemen.

The Royal Institution. Sir Humphry Davy.

The Royal Institution owed its foundation to an adventurer of genius, Count Rumford. He was an American who had

[1] *Morning Chronicle*, January 6, 1815.
[2] *Ibid.*, January 2, 1815.
[3] Bence Jones, *Life and Letters of Faraday*, pp. 52, 57–8.
[4] *Life of William Allen*, vol. i. pp. 26–7, 57, 58, 83. It was the Askesian Society which, at the suggestion of Dr. Babington, who was anxious to further the mineralogical research of the Comte de Bournon, founded first the *Mineralogical Society* (1799–1806), later the *Geological Society* (Woodward, *Geological Society*, pp. 7 sqq.).
[5] Adolphus, *British Empire*, vol. iii. p. 124.

provided himself at the Bavarian Court with a German title before he came to England in 1796. He was associated with Shute Barrington, Wilberforce and Sir Thomas Bernard in the foundation of the Society for Bettering the Condition of the Poor. To further the Society's programme he set himself to study methods of cheap feeding and heating. At once philanthropist and scientist, he invented economical stoves and transformed the theory of heat by important experiments. And he had the further support of Wilberforce and Sir Thomas Bernard in an undertaking which, if not in the strict sense philanthropic, was at least avowedly practical —the foundation of the Royal Institution "for diffusing the knowledge and facilitating the general and speedy introduction of new and useful mechanical inventions and improvements" and "for teaching by regular courses of philosophical lectures and experiments the application of the new discoveries in science to the improvement of arts and manufactures and in facilitating the means of procuring the comforts and conveniences of life." In other words, Rumford wished to found in England an institution similar to the "Conservatoire des Arts et Métiers" in Paris.[1]

Nevertheless, when Rumford in 1800 issued his appeal to the public, it was not received favourably by the manufacturers. Possibly their natural selfishness and distrust took alarm at his request for a supply of models for exhibition. Would not such an exhibition betray their secrets to competitors? The members of the aristocracy, on the other hand, subscribed liberally. Less secretive than the manufacturers, they were no less in need of machinery for the exploitation of their estates. At the request of the Board of Agriculture Davy gave a course of lectures at the Royal Institution on the chemistry of plants; and William Allen was charged with the investigation of problems of road transport and the construction of agricultural machinery.[2] Moreover, scientific curiosity, a curiosity which if disinterested was extremely superficial, was spreading among the leisured classes. They had discovered that science was amusing and that a clever lecturer could hold the attention of an ignorant audience by experiments in magnetism and chemistry. The Institution became a fashionable lecture hall, where the lectures were not confined to science. Sydney Smith moralized; Landseer, Campbell and Coleridge lectured on art and literature. The

[1] For Rumford's biography and the history of the Royal Institution, see Bence Jones, *The Royal Institution, its Founder and its First Professors*, 1871, specially p. 116.

[2] *Life of William Allen*, vol. i. pp. 111, 122, 132.

Royal Institution became the fashion;[1] but the nature of its success was not so satisfactory. The large audiences were too fashionable. When Dalton gave a course of lectures he spoke above the heads of his audience.[2] Thomas Young proved even more incomprehensible when he explained his revolutionary hypotheses on the nature of light, and dared to question the Newtonian dogma.[3] The Institution did not want for candid critics.[4] The writers of the *Edinburgh Review* condemned it as a useless toy, until a series of sensational discoveries made by Davy with the powerful electric battery of the Institution bestowed upon it the consecration of success. In June 1800 Sir Joseph Banks read, as a lecture before the Royal Society, a communication by Volta on the electricity generated by the mere contact of conductors of various composition.[5] In his paper Volta described as a scientific curiosity, and without claiming to draw any sort of theoretical conclusion from his discovery, the construction of the pile which has henceforth borne his name. Sir Joseph Banks' lecture and the subsequent publication of Volta's communication made the discovery of the Italian electrician known throughout England, and many men of science constructed Voltaic piles with the object of testing their power.[6] Nicholson, the editor of the *Journal*, and a surgeon named Carlisle discovered "by chance" that the Voltaic pile decomposed water, the hydrogen being attracted to the negative pole, the oxygen to the positive. Cruikshank proved that the Voltaic pile decomposed several salts, by an attraction of the alkalis to the positive pole. Wollaston attempted to show that when chemical changes were produced

[1] Bence Jones, *The Royal Institution*, p. 70.

[2] The official magazine of the Institution did not even publish the text of the lectures. See John Dalton, *A New System of Chemical Philosophy*, Part 1, 1808, Preface, p. 5.

[3] Even the *Edinburgh Review* was unable to follow him. See *Edinburgh Review*, January 1803, No. 2, Art. 16, *Bakerian Lecture on Light and Colour* (vol. i. pp. 450 sqq.); October 1804, No. 9, Art. 7, *Dr. Young's Bakerian Lecture* (vol. v. p. 97).

[4] *Journal of Lady Holland*, March 1, 1800 (vol. ii. p. 52): "Canning came. . . . He was witty upon the new Institution, which is a very bad imitation of the *Institut* at Paris; hitherto there is only one Professor, who is a Jack-of-all-Trades, as he lectures alike upon chemistry and shipbuilding." Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 60–1.

[5] *Phil. Trans.*, 1800, Part 2, pp. 403 sqq.

[6] For these experiments and generally for the history of Davy's electro-chemical discovery, see his *Bakerian Lecture on the Relations of Electrical and Chemical Changes*, June 8, 1826 (*Phil. Trans.*, 1826, Part 3, pp. 383 sqq.).

in the pile, the chemical not the electrical phenomena were fundamental and explained the latter.[1] Davy, whom Rumford had brought from Bristol and who was the most brilliant scientific lecturer at the Royal Institution, showed that in the decomposition of water by the pile, the oxygen was attracted to one pole, the hydrogen to the other, whatever substances animal or vegetable were placed in the intervening space. To be sure, there was much uncertainty as to the results of these first experiments. Cruikshank tried in vain to decompose certain salts. Davy and several other experimenters, English and French, showed that when water was brought into contact with the pile, a muriatic or nitro-muriatic acid was produced at the positive pole, and alkaline fixation at the negative. Did the pile then possess the power to produce alkalis and acids, and when its contact with salt gave rise to an acid and an alkali was their production due to the decomposition of the salt or rather, as appeared to be the case, when the pile acted upon water, was the sole cause the activity of the pile?

In 1806 Davy solved the problem. By means of a series of experiments, similar in character to the experiments of Lavoisier, he proved that, whenever the immersion in water of the two poles of the pile was followed by the production of an alkali and an acid, the water was not perfectly pure. The alkali and the acid were products of the decomposition of a salt.[2] In consequence of this discovery Davy continued his experiments from the standpoint reached already by Nicholson, Carlisle and Cruikshank. He proceeded further in the same direction and formulated a law of universal application, "that hydrogen, the alkaline substances, the metals and certain metallic oxides are attracted by negatively electrified metallic surfaces and repelled by positively electrified metallic surfaces, and contrariwise that oxygen and acid substances are attracted by positively electrified metallic surfaces and repelled by negatively electrified metallic surfaces."[3] This rendered possible, if not the identification of chemical with electrical affinity, at least the view that both phenomena were effects of a common cause, and that their intensities were proportional, the degree of the affinity being measured by the difference of the electrical condition.

Electro-chemistry had been born; and Davy's *Bakerian Lecture*, delivered in the November of 1806 to publish his

[1] *Phil. Trans.*, 1801, Part 2, p. 427.

[2] *Bakerian Lecture for* 1806, *on some Chemical Agencies of Electricity* (*Works*, vol. v. pp. 4 sqq.).

[3] *Bakerian Lecture for* 1806 (*Works*, vol. v. pp. 28–9).

results to the world, produced a profound impression. The *Edinburgh Review* expressed its surprise that Davy's genius had "escaped unimpaired from the enervating influence of the Royal Institution . . . and had indeed grown prodigiously in that thick medium of fashionable philosophy."[1] But the *Review* was obliged to admit,[2] as Davy himself declared,[3] that the discoveries would have been impossible without the apparatus which the Royal Institution placed at his disposal. And the Institution benefited immediately by Davy's work. A subscription in which all its aristocratic patrons took part brought in £2,000, and the sum was devoted to the construction of a gigantic pile containing 2,000 constituents.[4] With this apparatus Davy continued his researches, and established henceforward as the permanent Bakerian Lecturer, he communicated his results annually to the Royal Society of which the Institution in Albemarle Street had become an annexe. Renouncing hypothesis, for which he professed a distaste,[5] Davy proclaimed his intention to confine himself to the quest of facts. He was the first to decompose the

[1] *Edinburgh Review*, January 1808, No. 22, Art. 8, Davy's *Bakerian Lecture* (vol. xi. p. 390).

[2] *Edinburgh Review*, July 1808, No. 24, Art. 7, Davy's *Bakerian Lecture* (vol. xii. p. 394): "Mr. Davy owes much to his indefatigable industry and his knowledge of the subject; but he owes a great deal more to the powerful instrument which former discoveries put into his hands. Any man possessed of his habits of labour and the excellent apparatus of the Royal Institution could have almost ensured himself a plentiful harvest of discovery."

[3] *Elements of Chemical Philosophy*, Introduction (*Works*, vol. iv. pp. 37–8): "Nothing tends so much to the advancement of knowledge as the application of a new instrument. The native intellectual powers in different times are not so much the causes of the different success of their labours as the peculiar nature of the means and artificial resources in their possession. . . . Without the Voltaic apparatus there was no possibility of examining the relations of electrical polarities to chemical."

[4] Davy, *Elements of Chemical Philosophy* (*Works*, vol. iv. p. 110), also *Bakerian Lecture for* 1809, *sub finem* (*Works*, vol. v. pp. 282–3),

[5] *Bakerian Lecture for* 1826 (*Phil. Trans.*, 1826, Part 3, p. 390): "Believing that our philosophical systems are exceedingly imperfect, I never attached much importance to this hypothesis. . . . I have never criticised or examined the manner in which different authors have adopted or explained it—contented, if in the hands of others it assisted the arrangements of chemistry or mineralogy, or became an instrument of discovery." In the lecture of 1806 Davy was careful to warn his hearers that in the present state of the inquiry, a great extension of this hypothetical part of the subject would be premature (*Works*, vol. v. p. 41).

fixed alkalis, and to isolate two new elements, sodium and potassium.[1] For many years the constitution of muriatic and of oxymuriatic acid had eluded the researches of chemists. And the Lancashire manufacturers had a special interest in the inquiry, since Berthollet had taught them the use of oxymuriatic acid to bleach cotton.[2] Davy utilized the great pile of the Royal Institution to prove that so-called oxymuriatic acid was in reality a simple substance, namely chlorine, and that muriatic acid was not oxymuriatic acid minus a portion of its oxygen, but a compound of chlorine and hydrogen.[3] Similarly flouric acid was a compound of fluorine and hydrogen.[4] These discoveries of substances hitherto unknown were calculated to strike the popular imagination. And if they lacked the importance of the great electro-chemical discovery, they were not without a general bearing. They demolished certain fundamental principles of the Lavoisier school: no longer could oxygen be regarded as the universal generator of acids.[5] Following one after another, and announced in public every year amid the imposing surroundings of a scientific gathering, they carried Davy's fame to its height.

He was acclaimed, not without exaggeration, as a new Lavoisier, a second Newton. While the war was still raging he received a prize from the "Institut" at Paris, and a safe conduct enabling him to travel freely in France. He made a wealthy match, and had received a knighthood. He would soon be a baronet, and on the death of Sir Joseph Banks

[1] *Bakerian Lecture for* 1807 (*Works*, vol. v. pp. 57 sqq.).

[2] It was at Manchester that Dr. Henry had discovered, without, however, understanding the cause, that under the action of electricity muriatic acid released hydrogen. His discovery preceded the invention of the pile (*Phil. Trans.*, 1800, pp. 188 sqq.). See also Chevenix's anticipations in this sphere, *Observations and Experiments upon Oxygenized and Hyperoxygenized Muriatic Acid, and upon some Combinations of the Muriatic Acid in its three States*, January 28, 1802 (*Phil. Trans.*, 1802, pp. 165–6).

[3] *Bakerian Lecture for* 1810 (*Works*, vol. v. pp. 284 sqq.).

[4] *Ibid.*, 1813 (*Works*, vol. v. pp. 408 sqq.).

[5] For a moment Davy was induced to hazard hypotheses about the chemical action of hydrogen as "the principle of inflammability." But he checked himself at once, almost apologized. "Hypotheses," he wrote, "can scarcely be considered as of any value except as leading to new experiments, and the objects in the novel field of electro-chemical research have not been sufficiently examined . . . to enable me . . . to form any general theory concerning them which is likely to be permanent" (*Bakerian Lecture for* 1809; *Works*, vol. v. p. 282).

would succeed him as president of the Royal Society. But as his fame increased, his industry decreased. Researches into the constitution of iodine, and the invention of the safety lamp which bears his name, were little to occupy the twenty years of life which followed his work on chlorine and fluorine. The Royal Institution and the Royal Society were aristocratic clubs as well as scientific bodies. And Davy would ruin his health in the endeavour to combine the life of a man of the world with the work of a scientist. But the decline of his inventive power would not injure the progress in England of the science he had founded. And Davy himself detected the man who would be his successor in the field of electro-chemistry. In 1812 he took as assistant in his laboratory a young man named Michael Faraday, whose humble origin and initial struggles we have already mentioned. Thus the line of great physicists which has adorned modern England began with Beddoes, the eccentric chemist of the Pneumatic Association, and passed from Beddoes through Davy to Faraday.

In the preceding pages our object has been not so much to describe the progress of scientific theory as the social organization of scientific research in Britain at the opening of the 19th century. And we have seen that, with the exception of the Scottish universities, the sciences were cultivated by men who belonged to no definite school, who did not conduct their researches on lines previously laid down by a superior authority, who were in the strict sense of the term self-taught. Such were Herschel, Dalton and Davy. Such was Thomas Young, a London doctor, who varied the routine of his profession by the transformation of optics and the translation of Egyptian hieroglyphs. Such also was Sir David Brewster, who had just published his work on the polarization of light and who had never taught except as private tutor in the family of a Scottish nobleman. There existed no scientific body, with its professional code of conduct, prescribing to every worker his proper task, to be accomplished without heed of results, results foreseen for him by others, to be reaped by others after his death. Spontaneously, therefore of necessity imperfectly, the study of natural phenomena took shape in the provinces first, later in London. Hence the peculiar character of British science. Detailed researches, monographs, classifications there are few or none. On the other hand, there are a small number of important discoveries which bestow a new direction on the study of detail. The British scientist, like the British manufacturer, is the lucky inventor, the revolutionary.

This is true of the physicists and chemists whose work we have just described. It is even more true of those whose study was humanity. By these we do not mean the historians. Whatever the value of their work, it is impossible to regard the erudite investigations of Sharon Turner and Lingard, the dogmatic explanations of James Mill or the sweeping generalizations of Hallam, as marking an epoch in the history of human knowledge. We refer to those daring thinkers, taught only by their own reflection, Malthus, Ricardo and Bentham. Their powerful genius transformed the sociological sciences.

The Economists. Malthus and Ricardo.

Malthus' famous work, the *Essay on the Principle of Population*, had appeared in 1798. The father of Thomas Malthus was a Jacobin, an executor of Rousseau's will, and a disciple of the leveller and anarchist William Godwin. But the son did not share his father's humanitarian optimism, and refused to subscribe the creed of Priestley, Condorcet and Godwin, the belief in unlimited progress. He held that humanity had developed in a hostile environment, and was doomed to a never-ending warfare against it—that a life of plenty was not for man. For population tended to increase more rapidly than the means of subsistence. When he came to put in writing his objections to his father's faith, Malthus believed he could enforce his theory by giving it a mathematical form. "Population has," he maintained, "a constant tendency to increase beyond the means of subsistence. . . . Population, when unchecked, increases in a geometrical ratio. . . . The means of subsistence could not possibly be made to increase faster than in an arithmetical ratio." And "the necessary effects of these two different rates of increase, when brought together, will be very striking."

It was a gloomy book. Its conclusions were purely negative. But it appeared during the height of the anti-Jacobin reaction, and the moment was propitious for a refutation of the French Utopias. This amply accounts for the immediate success of the first edition—a small book hastily put together, a mere pamphlet of the moment. But is it a sufficient explanation of the permanent success of the book, of the astounding popularity of the Malthusian doctrine?

To account for this permanent popularity we must first of all remember that the economists of the British school differed from the physiocrats by regarding labour, not the bounty of nature, as the sole source of wealth, from the

Continental economists by finding the standard of value in labour, not in utility. But to maintain that labour is the sole source of wealth and the sole standard of value is to maintain that every pleasure is purchased at the cost of an equivalent or almost equivalent pain, that man is not born to plenty, that a parsimonious nature doles out to him in scanty measure the means of subsistence, and that population exercises on its resources an unremitting pressure. Malthus' doctrine was contained implicitly in the doctrine of all the preceding British economists. It can even be found explicitly, if incidentally, enunciated by Hume, Adam Smith and Stewart. Malthusianism, therefore, confirmed prejudices already dominant in economic science, fitted into the established tradition. This explains a permanent success which survived the accidental popularity enjoyed by the first edition of the *Essay*.

And we must also bear in mind that at the close of the 18th century the Poor Law was a source of perpetual anxiety to the English legislator. His aim was to obtain from the paupers relieved by the public a due return of labour. But during a period of grave distress he felt himself obliged to practise grave relaxations of principle. A host of pamphlets were published, whose authors, in conformity with the principles of Adam Smith and his followers, maintained that the system of poor relief, as it was administered in Great Britain, was opposed to the laws of nature, put a premium on idleness and incompetence, and encouraged the population to outgrow the means of subsistence. Among these pamphlets was Malthus' work.[1] In 1798, at a moment when the guardians were distributing relief with a reckless extravagance, Malthus endowed the economists with arguments of a novel and striking character to denounce the waste and to pass a wholesale condemnation upon the system of Poor Relief.

[1] To realize how closely the work of Malthus is attached to this entire class of literature, see especially the little treatise of John Townshend, *A Dissertation on the Poor Laws by a Well-wisher to Mankind*, 1786. Townshend is a forerunner of Malthus and even, through Malthus, of Darwin himself. We may also consider the following significant passage (*First Report of the Philanthropic Society*, 1789, p. 15): "So deeply perverted is the whole system of parish government, so defective in execution, as well as wrong in principle, that it falsifies the most substantial maxim in police, that population is the strength and riches of a State. By the creed of an overseer, the number of births is the standard of a nation's decay, and the command to increase and multiply was given as a scourge to mankind."

It would, therefore, be a grave error to treat Malthus, as the student might be led to treat him by a consideration of the circumstances which conditioned the first appearance of his work, as a mere pamphleteer of the counter-revolution. No doubt the harsh attitude which it implied towards the proletariate recommended Malthusianism to the mentality of the middle class. But the English middle class, though it remained sternly opposed to revolution and sentimentality, was increasingly open to the ideas of the Liberal reformers, as the anti-Jacobin panic faded from the public memory. The Tory organ, the *Quarterly Review*, was anti-Malthusian; the *Edinburgh Review*, the organ of the Radical Opposition, erected Malthusianism into a dogma.

No doubt in its author's pseudo-mathematical statement the Malthusian thesis is not easy to maintain; it would be difficult even to give it an intelligible meaning. Nevertheless, Malthus' combination of extreme simplicity and apparent scientific accuracy may well have recommended his book to a middle-class public which, though without any very solid education, prided itself on its scientific temper. It was hard to resist the suggestion made, and to refuse to credit the reality of a law stated with such assurance, defined so precisely. In the matter of scientific truth the self taught man is easily satisfied. Nor is his public more exacting. The historian Hallam would even declare the mathematical formulation of Malthus' principle of population to be as indubitable as the multiplication table.[1] And the day was at hand when Ricardo, more Malthusian than Malthus himself, was going to base on that principle the entire theory of the distribution of wealth, indeed well-nigh the whole of political economy.

The son of a Jewish stockbroker, Ricardo had never received a classical education. In fact his education had scarcely exceeded the standard of what we should now term primary education. Hardly fourteen years of age, he had entered business. In his scanty hours of leisure, and without a teacher, he completed his education as best he could. He studied chemistry and mineralogy, installed a laboratory in his home, was one of the first members of the Geological Society. But his favourite study was political economy. For it was related to the matters which were the subject of his professional work. We have already noticed his share in the controversy occasioned by the depreciation of the banknote, when a series of newspaper articles had revealed

[1] Quoted by Miss Harriet Martineau, *Autogiobraphy*, 1877 ed., vol. i. p. 210.

his capacity as a thinker. He was already a celebrity, if not yet the head of a school. That position would only be his when another economic question had attracted public attention, and Malthus had distinguished himself by a further discovery.

Since 1805 Malthus had been teaching history and political economy in the college established by the East India Company for the education of its servants. Little by little he had reached an original theory of rent which he regarded as the direct consequence of the *Principle* which he had formulated in 1798.[1] Since population tends to increase more rapidly than the means of subsistence, man is continually obliged to bring under cultivation soils of an inferior quality. Hence of necessity a constant increase in the cost of foodstuffs, which would increase also the reward of labour and of capital employed upon the lands first cultivated, did not both wages and profits tend to the normal level in the manner explained by Adam Smith. Hence, from the more fertile areas arises a surplus which is the income of the landlord—his rent. Thus the increase, nay the very existence of rent, is an effect, not a cause, of the increase in the cost of living. In England economic conditions favoured the acceptance of this theory. On the one hand, the census returns showed a rapid increase of population, and the soil of the United Kingdom was no longer sufficient to feed its inhabitants. On the other hand, rents were continuously rising. Plainly the two phenomena must be related as cause and effect. When the restoration of peace was followed by an agricultural crisis, a Parliamentary Commission was appointed to investigate its causes. A large proportion of the witnesses before this Commission maintained, almost unconsciously, the theory of Malthus.[2] Buchanan, in his edition of the *Wealth of Nations* published in 1814,[3] and the economist West in an essay published in 1815,[4] maintained theories closely akin to the theory of Malthus. Malthus decided that, if he were not to lose his property in the theory, he must

[1] For the modifications introduced into the passages which deal with rent in the successive editions of the *Principle of Population*, see Bonar, *Malthus and his Works*, p. 222.

[2] Cannan, *A History of the Theories of Production and Distribution in English Political Economy from* 1776 *to* 1848, pp. 147 sqq.

[3] *Observations on the Subjects treated of in Dr. Smith's Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, vol. iv. pp. 33 sqq.

[4] *An Essay on the Application of Capital to Land . . . by a Fellow of University College*, Oxford, 1815.

no longer delay its publication. He therefore published his essay on "the Nature and Progress of Rent."[1]

This was the signal for Ricardo to intervene. In a short essay "on the Influence of a low Price of Corn on the Profits of Stock,"[2] he accepted the two laws which Malthus had formulated and of which the latter depended upon the former, his law of population, and his law of rent. But he rejected the protectionist consequences which Malthus deduced from his laws in his essay in 1815. And to prove his own doctrine of Free Trade he built upon both an original system of laws regulating the distribution of wealth.

The law of wages is the first consequence of the law of population. According to this law, the amount of wages received by the labourer, the natural price of his labour, is the amount necessary to enable him to subsist and to perpetuate his species "without increase or diminution." For wages cannot decrease without the starvation of the labourer, nor increase without an increase of the population which will re-establish the equilibrium with the means of subsistence.

The law of profits followed. If the amount of wages, as calculated in terms of foodstuffs, remains fixed, that amount, as calculated in terms of money, must constantly increase, since the cost of extracting from the soil an equal amount of nourishment increases constantly, as the increase of population compels the cultivation of inferior soil. But this alteration of wages cannot affect rent which is a fixed quantity. It must therefore affect profits. Thus does the law of differential rent and, by implication, the principle of population explain a phenomenon universally verifiable—the progressive decrease of profits. With the natural progress of society the labourer remains at an equal level of bare subsistence, and the capitalist receives a constantly decreasing income. The landowner alone grows continually more wealthy, and this increase of wealth represents neither labour nor risk. Such was the outline of the system which Ricardo now set himself to develop in all its details and applications. Not till 1817 would he publish, as the fruit of two years' labour, his classic, the celebrated *Principles of Political Economy and Taxation.*

The character of this famous work is abstract, its style

[1] *An Inquiry into the Nature and Progress of Rent and the Principles by which it is regulated*, 1815.

[2] *An Essay on the Influence of a low Price of Corn on the Profits of Stock, showing the Inexpediency of Restrictions on Importation*, 1815.

arid. But because Ricardo is a difficult author to read, it does not follow that his work is academic, out of touch with practical life. What indeed was the origin of the principle of population on which the entire edifice is constructed? A pamphlet inspired by the circumstances of the moment, the whim of a publicist, indignant at the maladministration of the Poor Law. What, again, were the books with which in 1809 and in 1815 Ricardo had paved the way for his Political Economy? The reflections of a business man upon a controversy which was occupying Parliament and the Press. The simple notions from which Ricardo sets out in his attempt to construct an entire system of economics, were taken practically unaltered from the phenomena of contemporary life. His new theory of the distribution of wealth was an abstract defence of the passions which were exciting the London mob to riot, and were effecting a coalition of Labour and Capital against the landlord. This explains its immediate adoption as their political creed by an entire party, and the ease and rapidity with which it was popularized. In her *Conversations on Political Economy* which appeared in 1816, and whose aim, as the sub-title informs us, was "to explain in familiar language the elements of that science," Mrs. Marcet explained successfully the entire doctrine of Ricardo without misrepresenting a single point of importance.[1] "I know not why," said the hero of a Bulwer Lytton novel, published a few years later, "this study" (Political Economy) "has been termed uninteresting. No sooner had I entered upon its consideration, than I could scarcely tear myself from it."[2]

The Utilitarians. Bentham and his Disciples.

Thus by 1815 the theories of Malthus had been embodied by Ricardo in the classical tradition of political economy. But contemporaneously Ricardo's teaching was itself incorporated into an entire system of philosophy whose action upon British public opinion would be profound and lasting, the philosophy of Bentham and his school.

Unlike Malthus and Ricardo, Bentham did not achieve an immediate success. His *Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation* had been written about 1775, contemporaneously with the publication of Adam Smith's

[1] *Conversations on Political Economy, in which the Elements of that Science are familiarly explained,* 1816.

[2] Bulwer Lytton, *Pelham,* Book I, chap. xxxvi. 1st ed., 1828, vol. i. p. 336.

Wealth of Nations, and had been published in 1788 without attracting any attention. The countless manuscripts in which he expounded the plan of an entire system of jurisprudence, wholly different from the established system, emancipated from the domination of metaphysical fictions and founded on the rational and lucid principle of "general utility" or "the greatest happiness of the greatest number," had been composed before the *Introduction* was published. But it was not until 1802 that Dumont published in France the *Traités de Legislation Civile et Penale*. And even after their publication England continued to ignore Bentham, or, if he was known at all, it was not as a writer but as a philanthropist and, moreover, as an unsuccessful philanthropist. Bentham had invented a novel type of prison, a circular prison equipped with a system of central supervision, the Panopticon or house where everything is visible. He had sought to procure its adoption by the British Government, had offered to undertake the financial responsibility and administer himself the institution he proposed. He had even purchased out of his private resources a site for the future prison. But the passage through Parliament of an Act in favour of the scheme had borne no fruit. Neither Pitt nor his successors had given Bentham the support which he had been promised. Already sixty years of age, unknown as a philosopher, impotent as a philanthropist, his fortune devoured by the Panopticon scheme, he believed his career at an end, and his life a failure, when in 1808 he made the acquaintance of James Mill, who had just come up to London from Edinburgh University, and was laboriously earning a livelihood by hard work with his pen. Bentham converted Mill to his philosophy. Mill in return restored Bentham's self-confidence, propagated his ideas, and gathered around him a school of disciples. In the history of social science in Britain during the early 19th century the formation of this Benthamite school was an event of the first importance. The Benthamites were in the strictest sense of the term a sect and their influence is comparable in its extent to the influence of the Clapham sect. Possessed by an equal enthusiasm, their inspiration was widely different. Their thoroughgoing rationalism was in striking contrast with the emotionalism of the Evangelicals.

Only seven years had passed since the junction between Bentham and James Mill, only five since Mill had taken a house at Westminster, next door to Bentham's, and already the influence of Benthamism was spreading in every direction. James Mill was expounding its creed in the *Edinburgh Review*

and in the *Philanthropist*, the magazine of the Quaker William Allen. In the House of Commons Bentham's lifelong friend, the barrister Romilly, was urging year by year in conformity with his friend's principles a mitigation of the penal code, a reduction in the number of "capital felonies." James Mill introduced Bentham to Robert Owen and Lancaster, indeed, to all who were seeking the reform of society in a system of popular education: we have already seen the share taken by Bentham and his friends in the Lancastrian movement. James Mill became the friend of Ricardo and introduced him to his master: without Mill the *Principles of Political Economy and Taxation* would perhaps never have been written. And finally, it was through Mill that Bentham made the acquaintance of Francis Place, the famous electoral agent of the Westminster constituency. We have remarked the formation at Westminster about the person of Bentham of the youthful party of "Radicals." Fame had come to Bentham and with fame wealth. In 1813 Parliament had voted him a vast indemnity as compensation for the losses incurred in his Panopticon propaganda. A kindly and eccentric old man, owner of a house in town and a country seat, Bentham commanded an army of disciples. The philosophic and social ideas of the 18th century had awoken from a slumber of twenty-five years. What was the common philosophic principle on which the Utilitarians built their jurisprudence, their political economy and their politics? Man seeks pleasure and avoids pain. This, according to Bentham and his disciples, is the fundamental law of human action. The *summum bonum* is pleasure—not indeed the passing pleasure of the individual, which would render impossible a scientific treatment either of happiness or morality—but "general utility," "the greatest happiness of the greatest number." Hence a rational art of conduct presupposes the knowledge of the conditions which produce pleasure and pain—that the former may be sought, the latter avoided. And this knowledge is in turn only to be obtained by the construction of a psychology modelled on the natural sciences already in existence. But these fall into two classes, the sciences which collect facts, and the sciences which explain and construct a system of laws. It was after the pattern of the latter class, the sciences whose objects are elementary and simple phenomena, that the Utilitarians conceived their new science of human nature.

Such was the spirit of their age and country. It is a current belief that the English are cautious observers, with a keen eye for detail, careful to respect the complexity of nature,

as opposed to the French, who delight in intellectual constructions and in generalization. This belief, however, is far from the truth. In reality simplification has been the distinctive character of British thought during the 19th century. British men of science, for the reasons we have already determined—reasons of a strictly historical character—united the inexperience and the boldness, a boldness often successful, of the self-taught man. They were reasoners who sought and discovered simple laws, men of intuition, who claimed to perceive beneath the manifold of natural phenomena, the outlines of a machine, whose parts are few and whose motions are all sensible.[1] It was because it was at once the simplest hypothesis, and the most easily visualized that Dalton adopted the atomic theory: it rendered the fundamental composition of bodies visible. And the method of Bentham and his school was Dalton's method applied to the moral sciences. In both departments there was the same simplification, the same "atomism."

The human soul is a compound of elementary feelings, psychical atoms, agreeable feelings and disagreeable feelings, which differ in intensity, duration, number and the manner of their mutual combination.[2] And the laws which govern their association are few and simple, the law of association by likeness, and the law of association by contiguity. Perhaps even these two laws could be reduced to one, the law of association by likeness being a special case of the law of association by contiguity.[3] Bentham had translated a work

[1] This explains the small progress made by English scientists of this epoch in higher mathematics. The algorithm of algebra repelled them. They had no liking for this blindfold search of truth. Thomas Young, who cared the most for pure mathematics, avoided symbolic forms of proof, and used as far as possible the language of everyday life, thus making his works more difficult of understanding, by his very attempt to render them more popular (Peacock, *Life of Thomas Young*, pp. 116–17, 183). Similarly, when Berzelius, having accepted the atomic theory, attempted to describe the composition of bodies by formulæ in which the atoms were represented by letters to which were appended coefficients showing the number of atoms in a particular combination, Dalton denounced this new algebra, and described Berzelius' symbols as "horrible." The student of chemistry, he maintained, could as easily learn Hebrew (W. C. Henry, *Memoirs of . . . John Dalton*, p. 124).

[2] Bentham, *Principles of Morals and Legislation*, chap. iv. (*Works*, vol. i. pp. 15 sqq.).

[3] James Mill, *Analysis of the Human Mind*, chap. xi. (ed. 1878, vol. i. pp. 376–7).

of the Swedish chemist Bergmann. James Mill was the intimate friend of Thomas Thomson, a defender of the Daltonian atomism. Both were conscious imitators of the methods of the new chemistry. Their ideal moralist, educator and legislator must practise a mental chemistry and must learn from the chemist the art of constructing complex psychoses by the combination of simple elements.

The art of education would thus consist in effecting in the minds of children such an association of ideas that the child could no longer separate his personal happiness from the happiness of his fellows. The art of legislation would consist in producing a similar result in the mind of the adult. By associating the idea of certain actions with the idea of certain penalties the legislator would intimidate the potential criminal and prevent crime. The scientific analysis both of the crime and its penalty into their constituent elements, their atoms, and the establishment of an accurate proportion between both sets of factors, constituted, for the Utilitarian, the entire science of penology. Evidently a science of calculation and reasoning and nothing beyond. The Utilitarians neglected as useless learned research, knowledge of the historical growth of law. Their method was, as they fully realized, in radical opposition to the historical method which the professors of Germany were bringing into fashion. "One might," wrote Bentham in scorn, "open an historical school *à la mode d'Allemagne*. Der Herr Savigny in Germany could furnish admirable masters. . . . To the army and the navy of a country substitute, for example, a history of the wars waged by that same country. . . . to an order on a cook for dinner substitute a fair copy of the housekeeper's book as kept during the appropriate series of years."[1] These words express the hatred of the reformer for the traditionalist, of the self-educated man for the university scholar.

We may now adopt a slightly different point of view and consider not, as hitherto, the mutual combinations of simple psychoses in the individual consciousness, but the association of individuals to form a society. Bentham and his followers saw in society only an agglomeration of individuals, by nature existing in mutual isolation, and united solely by deliberate volitions. A certain proportion of individuals were happy, a certain proportion unhappy. Which side of the account showed a surplus? This was the balance which you must strike whenever you would appreciate a law or a custom. Such simple operations of addition and subtraction

[1] *Bentham, to his fellow Citizens of France, on Houses of Peers and Senates*, 1830 (*Works*, ed. Bowring, vol. iv. p. 425).

composed the entire intellectual task of the Utilitarian reformer. And this individualism may be regarded as a kind of sociological "atomism." It explains the line of reasoning which led the Utilitarians to political radicalism. And it was the foundation-stone of the entire edifice of the new political economy.

Suppose all the individuals, the atoms, out of which the social body is composed, perfectly selfish, inaccessible to any motive except a self-regarding prudence. Suppose them also perfectly rational, free from any liability to be blinded by passion. And finally, suppose them perfectly free, admitting no external constraint in the pursuit of their economic end. We thus construct a society as unlike any actual human society, as the simplified world of the sciences is unlike the world of sensible experience, but capable of rendering equal service in the explanation of phenomena. In fact, the hypothesis, precisely because of its simplicity, rendered possible an almost mathematically exact description of several economic phenomena such as the circulation of currency, exchange and banking. It even provided a sufficiently accurate account of the exchange of manufactured goods. And Ricardo believed that, when taken in conjunction with the Malthusian law of population, it enabled an equally accurate explanation to be given of the distribution of the profits of labour between the landlord, the capitalist and the labour. No attempt was made to discover empirical laws of observation. Nor was economic theory controlled by statistics. Political economy, as understood by Ricardo and James Mill, was built up by the series of hypothetical constructions whose character we have explained above. And this individualist theory was applied by individualist practice. The Utilitarians regarded the State as in principle incapable of controlling economics. It must stand aside and leave individuals free to regulate their economic interests, whether as between class and class, or nation and nation.

Thus was erected the finished edifice of Utilitarianism. It was frankly irreligious. Neither as the explanation of history, nor as the foundation of ethics or law did it invoke the supernatural, or any principle transcending sensible experience. Nor is it sufficient to call Utilitarianism irreligious. It was aggressively anti-religious, and regarded religion as a whole and Christianity in particular as the bane of civilization. For religion was of its very nature a form of asceticism, a perversion of feeling which made men desire pain and shun pleasure. And asceticism had produced a taste for slavery

of every description, political, legal and economic. Above all, asceticism was responsible for the notion of punishment as an "expiation," which had induced men to regard the infliction of punishment as a good thing in itself, and had thus led to that useless severity of the criminal code against which from the commencement of his literary activity Bentham had never ceased to protest. It would be impossible, without unduly anticipating the future, to relate the campaign of anti-Christian propaganda—no longer deist as in the days of Tom Paine, but frankly atheist—to which the Utilitarians would lend their aid. It dates from the years which followed the conclusion of peace. But even before 1815 the body of doctrines which composed philosophic radicalism exercised in every direction a subversive influence. Thus with Bentham and his friends we are at the opposite pole alike to the Toryism of the Government, and to Evangelical pietism. How then are we to explain the success of the Utilitarian propaganda in face of the hostility of Government, and the influence, felt universally, of the Protestant revival?

Influence of Benthamism. Utilitarianism and Pietism.

When the Tories wished to discredit Utilitarianism, they denounced it as an unpatriotic philosophy, inspired by foreign ideas, and especially by French ideas. Were not the political principles of the Benthamites the democratic principles of the Jacobins? Did they not derive their ethics and their jurisprudence from Helvetius and Beccaria, their psychology from Condillac, their philosophy of history and their political economy from Condorcet and Jean-Baptiste Say? Were they not irreligious Voltairians? Had not Bentham composed in French and published at Paris his *Traités de Legislation?*[1] But the Utilitarians could reply with truth that all these so-called French ideas, of whose importation they were accused, were in reality English ideas which had found a temporary home abroad.

Before its appearance in France democracy had been the political theory of the Anglo-Saxon rebels in America, and the Americans had themselves taken the principles which inspired their rebellion from Locke and the English republicans of the 17th century. Condillac's psychology had been the psychology of Hartley and Hume before Condillac ever set pen to paper. It was in England that

[1] For these French influences, see my *Formation du Radicalisme Philosophique*, vol. i. pp. 23 sqq.; vol. ii. pp. 219 sqq., 232 sqq.; vol. iii. pp. 231 sqq. and *passim.*

Voltaire had learned to be a Free Thinker. Throughout the anti-Jacobin reaction there had been thinkers—Erasmus Darwin, Thomas Day, Edgeworth, the political agitator Horne Tooke, Unitarians of the school of Priestley—who defended what they believed to be the national tradition against the innovations of the Tories. Among the ideas which composed the Utilitarian system, their economic theories tended more and more to take the first place. And, however great the influence of the French physiocratic school, Hume and Adam Smith were undoubtedly the founders of the new political economy, and the action of this political economy extended far beyond the sphere open to the complete Utilitarian system. The English are a nation of traders and can be governed only by men who possess the commercial mentality. Pitt, the leader of the anti-Jacobins, was a disciple of Adam Smith. Burke, at once the orator and the philosopher of the counter-revolution, was as zealous in the defence of economic individualism, as in the denunciation of political. When the Tories became a party of landlords and country squires, they signed their own death warrant. In this way their economic principles obtained for Utilitarianism an entrance into the governing classes.

Twenty-five years of Tory reaction, a reaction, when all is said, only skin deep, had proved insufficient to destroy intellectual traditions so deeply rooted. And moreover, what official body was in existence on which the party in office could rely to combat the ideas of the Benthamites? The Scottish universities? We have seen the empirical spirit which inspired the philosophers of the Scottish school. If they shrank from the conclusions of Hartley and his followers, their hesitation was due only to the extreme simplicity of the Hartleian generalizations. For they were men of university training, not self-educated men. But at bottom they differed from the radical empiricists only by their greater caution. Was Cambridge less exposed to the infection of Utilitarianism? We have seen that Cambridge had always professed Whig ideas in political philosophy and in philosophy generally. Locke, Paley and Hartley were the philosophers studied at Cambridge. A few years hence Benthamism will be the fashion among the Cambridge undergraduates.[1] There remained the impregnable citadel of Oxford. But Oxford was asleep and no one could possibly regard the remnants of Aristotelian scholasticism taught in her schools as a living intellectual tradition.

[1] John Stuart Mill, *Autobiography*, pp. 76–7.

To be sure, for the past twenty years there had existed on the Continent a new system of philosophy professed by men of genius, capable of attracting the rising generation and counteracting Utilitarianism. But it was not English. And how many Englishmen were able to read Kant, Fichte and Schelling in the original? The Scottish professors attempted to make the acquaintance of the new systems through the channel of French interpreters, Madame de Staël and De Gerando:[1] and what they understood, they disliked. Alone in England the poet Coleridge had been deeply influenced by German thought. He had abandoned verse for prose, and exchanged the naturalistic pantheism of his youth for a transcendental theology inspired by Schelling. But Coleridge, far more than Bentham, was an eccentric and lonely thinker. He belonged to no teaching body, to no national tradition. In 1815 his influence still counted for nothing.

England is a free country in which Government pressure plays no part in the formation of public opinion. It is not therefore surprising that the Utilitarian propaganda overcome the opposition of official Conservatism. It is more difficult to understand the influence exercised by Utilitarianism in an environment so impregnated with Evangelical religion as was the England of the early 19th century. Was the action of the two forces successive? And was Utilitarianism in 1815 a growing force, Evangelicalism on the verge of decline? Such an explanation would do violence to the complexity of the situation. The fundamental paradox of English society, which it is necessary to explain before we conclude this volume, is precisely the partial junction and combination of these two forces theoretically so hostile.

We have already spoken of the philanthropic activity common to both parties. Utilitarianism was a philosophy wholly practical. Bentham and his friends were ardent advocates of the Panopticon model prison, whose very idea had been conceived by their leader, of Lancaster's model school, and Robert Owen's model factory. They regarded these institutions as "moral" inventions, akin to the important technical inventions which were transforming industry, as "moral" machines ingeniously constructed for the automatic production of virtue and happiness. The Christian philanthropists, whatever their repugnance to such a mechanical conception of psychology and ethics, could not be deaf to the appeal of inventions so beneficent

[1] Dugald Stewart, *Dissertations . . .* (*Works*, 2nd ed., 1877, vol. i. pp. 394, 413, 416).

as these. Between the Utilitarians and the "old Dissenters" there existed little short of a permanent alliance. And even the Methodists and Evangelicals sympathized with the Utilitarian philanthropy. As their contribution to the common task the Christians brought their zeal, their missionary spirit, their love for a self-imposed discipline. Nor did the Utilitarians fail to appreciate these qualities. "Townshend," wrote Bentham, "was once what I had liked to have been, a Methodist, and what I should have been, had I not been what I am."[1] And the Utilitarians contributed their practical sense, their conviction of the possibility of a social technique, an art of employing the right means to obtain the desired end. Many Christian philanthropists, educated in the school of industrialism, shared their convictions on this point. But we may go further and discover closer affinities between Benthamite Utilitarianism and Protestant Pietism.

It would be a mistake to establish an irreconcilable opposition between the Utilitarian ethic and the Christian on the ground that the former is founded on pleasure, the latter on sacrifice. For Utilitarian morality cannot be described without qualification as a system of hedonism. It was based simultaneously on two principles. One of these was no doubt the identification of the ethical good with pleasure; but the other, of equal importance with the former, was the duty incumbent upon man, in virtue of the natural conditions to which his life is subject, to sacrifice present pleasure to the hope of future pleasure, and to purchase happiness at the cost of labour and suffering. This law of work, implicit in Bentham's moral arithmetic, was the principle explicitly proclaimed by the entire system of the classical political economy, and introduced into Utilitarianism an undeniable element of asceticism.[2] How can we explain the popularity of the Malthusian thesis at the very period when public opinion was apparently attached more closely than ever to the Christian tradition? Undoubtedly it contradicted one of the fundamental doctrines of the Bible. But it also refuted the atheistic humanitarianism of the 18th century, and taught that man is destined by his very nature to an unending struggle for existence, to a per-

[1] *Works*, ed. Bowring, vol. x. p. 92. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 508: "If to be an anti-slavist is to be a saint, saintship for me. I am a saint!"

[2] For the kinship between economic asceticism and Protestant asceticism, see the subtle, often indeed the excessively subtle, observations of Max Weber, *Die Protestantische Ethik und der Geist des Kapitalismus* (*Archiv für Sozial Wissenschaft und Sozial Politik*), 1905, vol. xx. pp. 1 sqq.; vol. xxi. pp. 1 sqq.

petual condition of hardship. And this appealed to the ascetic and Christian preconceptions of the public. It was in vain that the Benthamites attempted to reconcile the principle of population with the creed of unlimited progress, the pessimism of Malthus with the optimism of Condorcet. Their efforts could not abolish the distinction between the standpoint of the French Utilitarians and the standpoint of their English teachers. Benthamism, as its principles were popularized about 1815 by James Mill the Scotsman, was the French philosophy of the 18th century adapted to the needs of a nation moulded by a dogmatic and austere religion.

And moreover, the Utilitarians were individualists. The object of the entire ethical teaching was to bring home to the individual that society existed only through him and for his sake, and that it is his personal duty to maintain his rights and pursue his interest. To be sure, this individualism was not that theological individualism of the Protestant, whose character has been described above. And moreover, the new type of Protestantism, which sprang from Wesley's preaching in the previous century, was in this respect an enfeebled type. The organization of the Methodist sects was more hierarchic than the organization of the old seventeenth-century sects; and the Evangelicals were Methodists who had refused to break with the Anglican Church. But no Protestant revival could fail to be, in some measure at least, a revival of religious individualism. Between the secular individualism of Bentham and the authoritarian Christianity of the High Churchman, the liberal Protestantism of the Unitarians, Scottish Calvinism, the Methodist sects, the Evangelicalism of the Low Church party, constituted a series of imperceptible transitions. Nor was the individualism of the Utilitarianism radically anti-social. It did not exclude in principle all State intervention. For the Utilitarians looked to the legislature to establish a harmony of interests in the community by imposing obligations sanctioned by penalties. And even where they rejected Government interference, the Benthamites encouraged the formation of voluntary associations whose members would pursue a common end by the free surrender of a portion of their independence. Secular philanthropy and Protestant Dissent stood in equal need of such associations. They were thus among the typical expressions of private initiative in nineteenth-century England. British individualism is a moderate individualism, a mixture whose constituents are often mingled beyond the possibility of analysis, a compound of Evangelicalism and Utilitarianism.

CONCLUSION

FROM whatever point of view we study the institutions of Britain we are brought back to the same formula. England is a free country. But language is not a perfectly accurate instrument, and the same word can bear many meanings. What then are we to understand by British freedom?

After thirty years of Tory reaction, England was a free country. Such was the conclusion of our study of her political institutions. And we meant by this that England was a country in which the executive was systematically weakened in every direction. It would not even be true to say that government was based on the division of powers and that in this division the province of the executive was narrowly limited. On the contrary, the several branches of administration were confused in such a way that all the others encroached on the executive, and that the powers of its nominal head were reduced to a minimum. The actual executive consisted of the group of persons which composed the Cabinet, all members of the Legislature, and responsible to the Legislature. The Justices of the Peace, men of good family, scattered up and down the entire country, united judicial functions with administrative duties of the first importance. A free Press and the right of rebellion, ultimate guarantees of popular liberty against the encroachments of any department of Government, were a very real part of the British Constitution. And the jury system in turn guaranteed the liberty of the Press. The weakness of the Army, a weakness which survived even the large increase of numbers necessitated by a long war, made rebellion a serious possibility. Montesquieu was not wrong in describing the British Constitution as a mixed Constitution equally composed o monarchy, aristocracy and democracy. But it would perhap be more accurate to term it a confusion of oligarchy an anarchy.

We also pointed out that the economic system of England was a free system, and by that we meant that England was the country in which capitalism had developed more rapidly than in any other country in Europe, and therefore the

country in which the system of free contract had superseded most completely the system of custom, corporate trading and State regulation. Mechanical inventions had multiplied until men had come to regard a continual transformation of technical methods as the normal condition of industry. The guilds had disappeared, or had become mere social groups wholly devoid of compulsory powers. The State indeed still protected the manufactures and the agriculture of the nation against foreign competition. But as far as the former were concerned this protection had been rendered unnecessary by the enormous technical superiority of English methods of manufacture over the methods in use abroad. And agrarian protection had become inefficacious and unpopular: for it raised the cost of subsistence above the "natural" level. Therefore the principle of Free Trade was continually gaining ground. Moreover, the progress of Capitalism involved the accumulation of vast wealth in the hands of a few, and this in turn stripped increasing numbers of their property and reduced them to the condition of wage-earners. No legislation regulated the relations between the employer and his hands. The old statutes bore no application to the novel conditions of manufacture. And it was no easy task to build up the new system of laws demanded by the complexity of economic life. Alike in country and town the proletariate formed a disorganized and turbulent mass. The old political Whiggery of the noble families was gradually replaced or overlaid by the economic individualism of the commanders of industry. The political riot which from 1688 to the French Revolution had been the traditional expression of popular feeling in Great Britain gave way to the strike, the riot of the workers, the revolt of the hungry. England was the country of economic freedom, of unbridled competition, of class war.

And finally, if we consider the religious, the ethical and the intellectual conditions in England, we must still term England a free country. For England was a country in which the Established Church, whatever privileges it might enjoy, left the sects outside her borders entire liberty of organization, full power to form a host of little States within the State. Atheism and deism alone were excluded from this toleration, as anti-social systems. But certain sects, whose doctrine was practically indistinguishable from deism, had obtained a legal status and had just been secured by Act of Parliament from the bare possibility of persecution. Of official protection of art, literature or science there was little or none. Although the Tory monarch, George III, had shown signs

of a desire to put an end to the traditional inaction of the Crown in this sphere, had founded the Royal Academy, and had encouraged the reorganization and rejuvenation of the Royal Society, all that was best in the intellectual life of Britain developed apart from royal interference. The absence or insufficiency of royal patronage was supplied by the patronage of the aristocracy. And the patronage of the new industrial class counted for even more. Throughout this youthful British society, free from all Court ties, free even from any connexion with the governing aristocracy, independent thinkers were at work, who carried on their experiments and made their discoveries unguided and uncontrolled. Did this lack of organization in the religious and in the scientific world produce the same anarchy which we have remarked in the political and in the economic sphere? Certainly not, for the following reason.

The religious bodies whose freedom was respected by the State were societies which, because they lacked the power of legal coercion, were obliged to direct their efforts to the establishment of a powerful moral authority alike over their own members and over society as a whole. And their efforts were successful. They exercised the influence they sought. Not only did they encourage the growth in every sphere of a spirit of free association, and occasion directly or indirectly the mass of voluntary institutions both philanthropic and scientific so characteristic of modern England. They disturbed the torpor of the Government and even of the Established Church. They occupied themselves with the regulation of public morality, compelled the application of existing laws, revived laws which had fallen into abeyance, demanded new legislation. Uniting their influence with the influence of industrialism, they fashioned the character of the English middle class, dogmatic in morals, proud of its practical outlook, and sufficiently powerful to obtain respect for its views from the proletariate on the one hand, from the aristocracy on the other. The ruling classes watched the growth of this new power, whose nature they could not comprehend. They knew that the British Constitution did not give them sufficient strength to repress a general rebellion. And they perceived that the development of industrialism was rendering the social order more unstable and multiplying industrial and political crises. So they called to mind the French Revolution and the American War of Independence and feared "Methodism" almost equally with Jacobinism. Had they understood the situation better, they would have realized that Methodism was the antidote to Jacobinism,

and that the free organization of the sects was the foundation of social order in England. "England is a free country"; this means at bottom that England is a country of voluntary obedience, of an organization freely initiated and freely accepted.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

WORKS OF GENERAL REFERENCE[1]

For the period *immediately* preceding 1815 there exists no English history which can claim to be a scientific treatment of the subject.

Lecky (W. E. H.). A History of England in the Eighteenth Century, 1st ed., 8 vols., 1878—90; new ed., 7 vols., 1892.
Concludes with the year 1792.

Massey (W.). A History of England during the Reign of George the Third, 4 vols., 1st ed., 1855—63; 2nd ed., 1865.
Contains interesting details of social life. Nothing after 1802.

Alison (Archibald). History of Europe from the Commencement of the French Revolution in 1789 to the Restoration of the Bourbons in 1815, 1st ed., 10 vols., 1833—42. We have used the 7th ed., 20 vols., 1848.
An abundantly detailed account of diplomatic, military and economic history; written from the Tory standpoint.

Jesse (J. Heneage). Memoirs of the Life and Reign of King George the Third, 3 vols., 1867.
Deals exclusively with political history (Cabinet crises, etc.), superficial.

There have appeared recently a number of textbooks whose value is unequal. All are very elementary.

MacCarthy (Justin). A History of the Four Georges, 4 vols., 1884–1901.

Dorman (M. R. P.). A History of the British Empire in the Nineteenth Century, 2 vols., 1902–4.
Unfinished; leaves off at 1815; very superficial; deals exclusively, or almost exclusively, with foreign politics.

[1] A small number of titles of books, which have appeared since this work was first written in 1913, have been added in order to bring the Bibliography up to date. But the author wishes it to be clearly understood that this translation, though containing a fairly large number of corrections, is not what he would like to call in the full sense of the word a revised edition. All books here mentioned, and which have been published in 1913 and later, should therefore not be taken as having been sources to the present History; they are merely mentioned because they may convey useful information to our readers.

Brodrick (the Hon. George C.). The History of England, from Addington's Administration to the close of William IV's Reign (1801–37) . . . completed and revised by J. K. Fotheringham, 1 vol., 1906.

Mathieson (William Law). England in Transition (1789–1832). A Study of Movements, 1920.

Maxwell (Sir Herbert Eustace). A Century of Empire, 1801–1901, 3 vols.; vol. i (1801–32), 1909.

Good sketches of the general condition of Britain will be found at the beginning of:

Walpole (Spencer). A History of England from the Conclusion of the Great War in 1815, 1st ed., 5 vols., 1878–86; new ed. revised, 6 vols., 1890.

Martineau (Miss Harriet). The History of England during the Thirty Years' Peace, 1816–46, 2 vols., 1849–50.

Cory (William). A Guide to Modern English History, 2 vols., 1880–2.

Valued by English students of history.

In:

The Cambridge Modern History, vol. viii., The French Revolution, 1904, vol. ix, Napoleon, 1906, vol. x, The Restoration, 1907.

The joint work of a number of professors. There are very few chapters on the internal history of England during our period.

For the study of British Diplomacy:

The Cambridge History of Foreign Policy, 1783–1919, edited by Sir A. W. Ward and G. P. Gooch, vol. i (1783–1815), 1922.

Webster (C. K.). British Diplomacy, 1813–15. Select Documents, ed. by ——, 1921.

A collection of documents, partly new, always well chosen.

For an accurate but dry account of the political institutions of England in 1815, see:

Adolphus (John). The Political State of the British Empire, 4 vols., 1818.

Also for further detail:

Montveran (M. de). Histoire critique et raisonnée de la Situations de l'Angleterre, au 1er Janvier, 1816, sous les rapports de ses finances, de son agriculture, de ses manufactures, de son commerce et sa navigation, de sa constitution et ses lois et de sa politique extérieure, 8 vols., 1819.

But especially

Traill (H. D.) and Mann (J. S.). Social England, a record of the progress of the people in religion, laws, learning and arts, industry, commerce, science, literature and manners, from the earliest times to the present time, by various writers, edited by———, 6 vols., 1st ed. 1893; 2nd ed. 1898. Vol. v (1714–1815), vol. vi (1815–85).

A storehouse of interesting information concerning the social history of England. Every chapter is the work of a specialist.

Original Sources.

The principal sources are:

(*a*) The Collections of Debates.

The Parliamentary Register, or History of the Proceedings and Debates of both Houses . . . 4 series, 1774–1813.

Cobbett's Parliamentary History of England, 1806–28, vols. i-xii 1066–1713, vols. xiii-xxxvi 1743–1803.

These two collections will often be found to supplement each other must usefully.

Cobbett's and (after vol. xxiii.) Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, from 1803, 1st series, 41 vols., 1803–20.

Index 1834, for the years 1803–30.

(*b*) Collections of Statutes, especially:

Pickering (D.). The Statutes at large from Magna Charta to 1806, 46 vols., 1672–1807.

(General indices after vols. xxiv and xxxviii.)

—— The Statutes of the United Kingdom . . . vol. xlvii et sqq.

Chitty (Joseph). A Collection of Statutes of Practical Utility, with notes thereon: intended as a Circuit and Court Companion, 2 vols., 1829.

(*c*) Contemporary Magazines, such as:

The Annual Register; or, a view of History, Politics and Literature. An annual from 1758.

The Gentleman's Magazine and Historical Chronicle. A monthly from 1731.

Two indices, 1789 for the years 1731–86, 1821 for 1787–1818.

(*d*) The great contemporary Reviews:

The Edinburgh Review.
From 1802.

Index to the first 20 vols., 1813; to vols. xxi-l, 1832. A Liberal organ.

The Quarterly Review.
From 1809.

Index to first 20 vols. after vol. 20, 1820; to vols. xxi-xxxix after vol. xl, 1831. Conservative; the organ of Canning's group.

(*e*) Dailies or papers appearing at very frequent intervals:

See above, Book I, chap. ii for a list of the principle newspapers.

We have made frequent use of them.

Cobbett's Annual Register (from 1802) and Political Register (from 1804, the continuation of the former).

A most valuable collection full of documents of every description, also articles of political criticism or satire.

(*f*) Biographies, Memoirs, Correspondence:

Their number is very large and taken as a whole are a source of valuable information to the historian. But as a rule they have been commissioned by the family of their subject and hence are full of deliberate omissions; and their compilation has been too often entrusted to incompetent journalists, who fail to make full use of their documents. No detailed bibliography can be given here (see the special headings below), but mention must be made of the excellent

Dictionary of National Biography, edited by Leslie Stephen and afterwards by Sydney Lee, 1st ed. 1885–1900.

(*g*) Travels:

These contain much valuable information. This is true of the accounts by English travellers of journeys in their own country, and even more true of the relations of foreign travellers. *See especially:*

Pictet (M. A.). Voyage de trois mois en Angleterre, en Écosse, et en Irlande pendant l'été de l'an ix An xi (1802).

Barber (J. T.). A Tour throughout South Wales and Monmouthshire, 1803.

Warner (Rev. Richard). A Walk through Wales, 1799.

—— A Walk through some of the Western Counties of England, 1800.

—— A Tour through the Northern Counties of England, and the Borders of Scotland, 1802.

—— A Tour through Cornwall in the autumn of 1808, 1809.

Nemnich (P. A.). Neuste Reise durch England, 1807.

Svedenstjerna (Th.). Resa igenom en Del of England, 1804 (German translation from the Swedish, 1807).

Ayton (R.). Voyage round Great Britain, . . . undertaken in the summer of the year 1813, 8 vols., 1814–25. (Continued from vol. iii by W. Daniell.)

Journal of a Tour and Residence in Great Britain during the years 1810 and 1811, by a French traveller [Louis Simond], 1815.

M—— (A. J. B. Defauconpret). Quinze jours à Londres à la fin de 1815, 1816 —— Six mois à Londres en 1816. 1817.

Irving (Washington). The Sketch-book of Geoffrey Crayon, 1st ed., 1820.

Etc., etc.

BOOK I

POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS

I. GENERAL

Montesquieu, L'Esprit des Lois, 1748.

Blackstone (Sir William). Commentaries on the Laws of England, 4 vols., 1st ed., 1765–9.

Its Constitutional theory follows Montesquieu closely—some passages are an actual translation of Montesquieu.

De Lolme. Constitution de l'Angleterre, 1st ed., 1771. (First English edition, enlarged, under the title: The Constitution of England, or an Account of the English Government; in which it is compared with the Republican form of Government, and occasionally with the other monarchies in Europe, 1775.)

Burke (Edmund). The Works of the Right Honourable——. We have used the 2nd ed. in 16 vols., 1803–27.

The Black Book; or Corruption Unmasked, . . . 1820.
Violent but extremely well informed. It enumerates all the political abuses then prevalent.

Russell (Lord John). An Essay on the History of the English Government and Constitution, from the reign of Henry VII to the present time, 1821; 2nd ed. (greatly enlarged), 1823; new ed., 1865.

Creasy (Edward Shepherd). The Rise and Progress of the English Constitution, 1853. 17th ed. revised; 1907.
An elementary textbook.

Gneist (Rudolph). Das heutige Englische Verfassungs-und Verwaltungsrecht, 2 vols., 1857.

Franqueville (Charles de). Les Institutions Politiques, Judiciaires, et Administratives de l'Angleterre, 1st ed., 1863; new ed., in 3 vols., 1887.

Todd (Alpheus). On Parliamentary Government in England, 2 vols., 1867–9.
New edition abridged and revised by S. Walpole, 2 vols., 1892.

Hearn (William Edward). The Government of England: its Structure and Development, 1867; 2nd ed., 1887.

May (Sir Thomas Erskine, Baron Farnborough). The Constitutional History of England since the accession of George III 1760–1860, 2 vols., 1861–2; new ed. with an additional chapter, 1879.

Glasson (E. D.). Histoire du Droit et des Institutions Politiques Civiles et Judiciaires de l'Angleterre, comparés au Droit et aux Institutions de la France depuis leur origine jusqu'à nos jours, 2 vols., 1882.

Dicey (Albert Venn). Lectures introductory to the Study of the Law of the Constitution, 1885. From the third edition the work bears the title: Introduction to the Study of the Law of the Constitution. 7th ed., 1908.

Anson (Sir William Reynell). The Law and Custom of the Constitution: Part I, Parliament; Part II, The Crown, 1st ed., 1886.

Hatschek (Dr. Julius). Englisches Staatsrecht, mit Berücksichtigung der für Schottland and Irland geltenden Sonderheiten. I. vol. Die Verfassung, 1905; II. vol. Die Verwaltung, 1906 (2 volumes of the Handbuch des Oeffentlichlen Rechts de Gegenwart, by Marquardsen, von Seydel, G. Jellinek and Piloty).

The following works:

Boutmy (E.). Le Devéloppement de la Constitution et de la Société Politique en Angleterre, 1887.

Dicey (Albert Venn). Lectures on the Relation between Law and Public Opinion in England during the Nineteenth Century 1905.

are more general and more philosophical.

II. THE SYSTEM OF ADMINISTRATION

A. THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT

1. The Reform of Abuses: Official Documents.

The Reports of the Commissioners appointed to examine, take and state the Public Accounts of the Kingdom, presented to His Majesty and to both Houses of Parliament; with the appendices complete, 1783, 1785, 1787.

Finance Reports, 1797–8; and Proceedings thereupon, 1798–1803, with a general index to the whole (36 reports).

Naval Inquiry. Reports of Commissioners, 1802–6 (14 reports).

Commission for regulating and revising the Civil Affairs of the Navy, 1805. Reports of the Commissioners, 1806–9 (13 reports).

Military Inquiry. Reports of Commissioners of Inquiry, 1806–12 (19 reports). Index to the entire collection, 1816).

Reports from the Select Committee appointed to draw up Articles of Impeachment against Army, Lord Viscount Melville, 1805–6 (3 reports).

Minutes of Evidence taken before the Committee of the Whole House, appointed to investigate the Conduct of His Royal Highness the Duke of York, the Commander-in-Chief, with regard to Promotions, Exchanges and Appointments to Commissions in the Army and Staff of the Army, and in raising Levies for the Army, 1809.

Reports from the Committee appointed to examine and consider what regulations and checks have been established in order to control the several Branches of the Public Expenditure in Great Britain and Ireland, and how far the same have been effectual, and what further measures can be adopted for reducing any part of the said Expenditure, or diminishing the amount of Salaries and Emoluments, without detriment to the Public Service, 1807–12 (13 reports).

Reports from the Select Committee appointed to consider what Offices in the United Kingdom and in the Foreign Dominions of His Majesty come within the purview of the second, third and fourth Resolutions of the House, on the Third Report from the Committee on Public Expenditure of the United Kingdom, 1810–12 (3 reports).

Reports from Select Committee on Sinecure Offices, 1810–12 (3 reports).

Reports from the Select Committee appointed to inquire into and state the Income and Expenditure of the United Kingdom for the year ended the 5th January, 1817, and also to consider and state the probable Income and Expenditure (so far as

the same can be estimated) for the years ending the 5th of January 1818, and the 5th of January 1819 respectively; and also to consider what further measures may be adopted for the Relief of the Country from any part of the said Expenditure, without detriment to the Public Interest (Sinecure Offices), 1819.

A Return of the Number of Persons employed, and Pay, and Salaries granted to such Persons, in all Public Offices or Departments, in the year 1797; and in the years 1805, 1810, 1815 and 1819; showing the increase in each of these years, as compared with 1797. Also, a Return for 1827, showing the Reduction that has been made since 1819. 1828.

2. Besides the works which give a general account of British political institutions (see especially Gneist) there exists no book dealing with the administrative system except the little work, a mere outline, by

Eaton (Dorman Bridgman). Civil Service in Great Britain; a history of abuses and reforms and their bearing upon American politics, 1880.

See also Herbert Joyce's monograph:

Joyce (Herbert). The History of the Post Office from its Establishment down to 1836. 1893.

3. The Judicature, the Bar, the Administration of the law.

(i) *General.*

Cottu (Charles). De l'Administration de la Justice Criminelle en Angleterre et de l'esprit du Gouvernement Anglais 1820, 2nd ed., 1822 (English translation, 1822.)

Pearce (R. R.). A History of the Inns of Court and Chancery; with Notices of their Ancient Discipline, Rule, Orders, etc., 1848.

(ii) *Biographies.*

Campbell (John, Lord). The Lives of the Lord Chancellors and Keepers of the Great Seal of England, from the earliest times to the reign of King George IV, 1st ed., 8 vols., 1845–8; 4th ed., 10 vols., 1856–7.

—— The Lives of the Chief Justices of England, from the Norman Conquest till the death of Lord Tenterden, 3 vols., 1849–57; 3rd ed., 4 vols., 1874.

—— Life of John, Lord Campbell, Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain; consisting of a selection from his autobiography, diary and letters, edited by his daughter, 1881.

Townshend (William Charles). The Lives of twelve eminent Judges of the last and the present century, 2 vols., 1846.

Eldon (Lord Chancellor——). The public and private Life of ——, with selections from his correspondence by Horace Twiss, 3 vols., 1844.

Kenyon (Lloyd, first Lord ——). The Life of ——, by G. T. Kenyon, 1873.

(iii) *The Reform of Abuses.*

Stephen (Sir James Fitzjames). A History of the Criminal Law of England, 3 vols., 1883.

Bentham (Jeremy). Works, ed. Bowring, 11 vols., 1838–43.

Romilly (Sir Samuel). Memoirs of his Life, written by himself; with a selection from his Correspondence, ed. by his sons, 3 vols., 1840.

B. LOCAL GOVERNMENT

1. Official Documents

Report from the Select Committee appointed to inquire into the state of the Municipal Corporations in England and Wales and Ireland, . . . 1833.

First and Second Reports of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the Municipal Corporations in England and Wales, 1835, 1837 (Analytical Index, 1839).

First Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the Municipal Corporations in Ireland, 1835.

General Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the state of Municipal Corporations in Scotland, 1835.

2. General

Burn (Richard). The Justice of the Peace and Parish Officer upon a plan entirely new, and comprehending all the Law to the present time, 2 vols., 1755; 29th ed., 5 vols., 1845.

Merewether (H. A.). A Sketch of the History of Boroughs and the Corporate Right of Election, 1822.

—— and Stephens (A. J.). The History of the Boroughs and Municipal Corporations of the United Kingdom from the earliest to the present time, with an examination of records, charters and other documents, illustrative of their constitution and powers, 3 vols., 1835.

Cockburn (A. E.). The Corporations of England and Wales; containing a succinct account of the constitution, privileges, powers, revenues, and expenditure of each corporation; together with details showing the practical working of the Corporation System in each borough or city, and any defects or abuses which have been found to exist. The whole collected and abridged from the reports of the Commissioners for inquiring into Municipal Corporations, 2 vols., 1835.

Smith (J. Toulmin). The Parish: its Obligations and Powers, its Officers and Duties; with illustrations of the practical working of their institution in all secular affairs, 1854.

—— Local Self-Government and Centralization; the characteristic of each, and its practical tendencies as affecting social, moral, and political welfare and progress, including comprehensive outlines of the English Constitution, 1851.

A protest against the tendency of modern legislation to centralize the administration. It insists on the democratic nature of the old parochial self-government.

Gneist (Rudolf). Geschichte und heutige Gestalt der englischen Communalverfassung oder des Self-government, 2nd ed., 2 vols., 1863.

(Also the work already mentioned of this eminent authority on constitutional law and the system of administration.)

Should be supplemented by the first-rate work of:

Redlich (Josef). Englische Lokalverwaltung. Darstellung der inneren Verwaltung Englands in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung und in ihrer gegenwartigen Gestalt, 1901. (English translation with additional matter by F. W. Hirst, 1903.)

And especially by the standard work now in course of publication (6 vols. have appeared, 1924).

Webb (Sidney and Beatrice). English Local Government from the Revolution to the Municipal Corporations Act, 1906.

III. ARMY AND NAVY

A. GENERAL

Army Appointments. Report from the Select Committee appointed to inquire into the Establishment of the Garrisons, of Pay and Emolument of General and Staff Officers, and into the Emoluments of Naval Officers holding the Appointments of Vice- and Rear-Admirals of the United Kingdom, or of Generals and Colonels of Marines, and whether any and what Reduction or Alteration can be made in them without detriment to the Public Service, 1833.

Report of Commissioners . . . into Naval and Military Promotion and Retirement, 1840.

B. THE NAVY

1. Official Documents

Navy. Accounts and Papers. Strength of the Navy: Men, Boys, Wages, etc. Account of the Men serving and Sums voted, from 1783 to 1793, 1819.

2. General Histories

James (William). The naval history of Great Britain from the declaration of war by France in 1793, to the accession of George IV, 1st ed., in 5 vols., 1822. New ed. with additional matter and notes, . . . by Captain Chamier, in 6 vols., 1837.

Extremely technical. Deals exclusively with the ships and other material equipment of the Navy, and does not treat of the crews. Should be supplemented by the standard work of

Clowes (William Laird). The Royal Navy. A history from the earliest times to the present, 7 vols., 1897–1903. Vol. iv (1775–1802). Vol. v (1803–15).

Also the almost contemporary work by:

Brenton (Captain Edward Pelham). The Naval History of Great Britain from the Year 1783 to 1822, 5 vols., 1825–8.
Contains very intelligent criticism.

See also the excellent picture given by

Dupin (Baron Charles). Voyages dans la Grande-Bretagne, entrepris relativement aux services publics de la Guerre, de la Marine, et des Ponts et Chaussées, de 1816, à 1821. Deuxième Partie Force Navale, 1821.

And the textbook by:

Hannay (David). A short History of the Royal Navy, 1217–1815; vol, ii (1689–1815), 1909.

The publications of the Navy Record Society should also be consulted, especially the two volumes edited by M. Julian Corbett, and entitled:

Fighting Instructions (1530–1816). Signals and Instructions (1776–1794).

Chevalier (Edouard). Histoire de la Marine Française sous la premiere Republique 1886, sous le Consulat et l'Empire, 1806.

For the theory of naval warfare see:

Mahan (Captain A. T.). The Influence of Sea-Power upon the French Revolution and Empire, 1793–1812, 2 vols. 1892.
—— Sea-power in its Relations to the War of 1812, 2 vols., 1905.

3. Contemporary Pamphlets dealing with particular Questions.

Butler (Charles. On the Legality of Impressing Seamen, 1778. (See Pamphleteer, No. XXIII, 1824).

Patten (Philip). The Natural Defence of an Insular Empire, earnestly recommended, with a sketch of a plan to attach real seamen to the service of their country, 1810.

A Letter to the Right Honourable Lord Melville on the present condition of officers in the Royal Navy, by a Post Captain, 1811.

An Inquiry into the present state of the British Navy, together with reflections on the late war with America, and its probable consequences, by an Englishman, 1815.

Napier (Sir Charles). The Navy: its past and present State. In a series of letters, 1851.
Written between 1816 and 1850.

Cochrane (Thomas, Earl of Dundonald). Observations on Naval Affairs, and on some collateral subjects; including instances of injustice experienced by the author, 1847.

4. Biographies.

Marshall (Lieut. John). Royal Naval Biography. . . . 12 vols., 1823–35.

A mere list of the superior officers with short biographical notices.

Mahan (Captain A. T.). Types of Naval Officers drawn from the History of the British Navy, with some account of the conditions of naval warfare at the beginning of the eighteenth century, and of its subsequent development during the said period, 1902.

Collingwood (Lord). A Selection from the Public and Private Correspondence of Vice-Admiral ——, by G. L. Newnham Collingwood, 4th ed., 1829.

Exmouth (Admiral, Viscount). The Life of ——, by E. Osler, 1835.

Jervis (John, Earl of Saint-Vincent). Life and Correspondence of ——, by P. E. Brenton, 2 vols., 1838.

—— Memoirs of ——, by J. S. Tucker, 2 vols., 1844.

Nelson (Admiral Lord). The Life of ——, from his manuscripts, by J. S. Clarke and J. MacArthur, 2 vols., 1809; new ed., 1840.

—— Memoirs of the Life of ——, by Thomas Joseph Pettigrew, 2 vols., 1849.

—— Letters and Dispatches of ——, selected and arranged by John Knox, 1886.

Saumarez (Admiral Lord de). Memoirs and Correspondence of ——, by Sir John Ross, 2 vols., 1838.

C. THE ARMY

1. Official Documents

In addition to the documents mentioned under the previous heading, see:

Report of Commissioners for inquiring into the System of Military Punishments in the Army, 1836.

2. General

Dupin (Baron Charles). Voyages dans la Grande-Bretagne, entrepris relativement aux services publics de la Guerre, de la Marine et des Ponts et Chaussées, de 1816 à 1821. Première Partie. Force Militaire, 1820.

Clode (C. M.). The Military Forces of the Crown: their Administration and Government, 2 vols., 1869.

This remains the standard authority on the subject.

Fortescue (the Hon. J. W.). A History of the British Army. Eleven vols. have already appeared (1923), ending with 1838. Contains many documents hitherto unpublished. It is a pity, from our point of view, that the work should too often degenerate into a history of campaigns. The ground here neglected is however fortunately covered by the same author's smaller work:

—— The County Lieutenancies and the Army, 1803–14, 1 vol., 1909.

It deals with the methods of recruiting at this period.

3. Histories of the Peninsula War

Foy (General. Histoire de la Guerre de la Péninsule sous Napoléon, . . . published by la Comtesse Foy, 4 vols., 1827. (English translation, 1827).
The first volume of an excellent "Political and Military Description of the contending Powers."

Napier (Major-General W. F. P.). History of the War in the Peninsula and in the South of France, from 1807 to 1814, 6 vols., 1828–40.
Concerned almost exclusively with tactics and strategy.

Oman (Sir C. William Chadwick). A History of the Peninsula War.
In course of publication, 6 vols. have appeared 1902–22, which bring the history to August 1813. Of very considerable merit as a scientific treatment of its subject.

—— Wellington's Army, 1800–1814.

4. Biographies, Memoirs, Correspondence.

Wellington (Arthur Wellesley, Duke of). The Dispatches . . . from 1799 to 1818, compiled . . . by Lieut.-Colonel Gurwood, 1st ed., 13 vols., 1834–9, with additions, 8 vols., 1844; we have used the edition in 12 vols. (1799–1815), 1837–8. Also: Supplementary Dispatches and Memoranda, edited by his son, the Duke of Wellington, 12 vols., 1858–65; new series, 3 vols., 1867–8.

Wellington (Arthur Wellesley, Duke of). The Life of——: the Restoration of the Martial Power of Great Britain, by Sir Herbert Maxwell, 2 vols., 1st ed., 1899; 6th ed., 1907.

Combermere (Field-Marshal Viscount). Memoirs and Correspondence of ——, by Mary, Viscountess Combermere and Captain W. W. Knollys, 2 vols., 1866.

IV. THE COLONIES

1. An interesting General Account

Egerton (H. E.). A Short History of British Colonial Policy, 1897 (Bibliography).

2. Monographs.

Mill (James). The History of British India, 1st ed., 3 vols., 1817; 4th ed., with notes and appendix by H. H. Wilson, 9 vols., 1840–8.

Edwards (Bryan). History of the British Colonies in the West Indies, 4th ed., 3 vols., 1807.

Southey (T.). Chronological History of the West Indies, 3 vols., 1827.

Bridges (G.). The Annals of Jamaica, 2 vols., 1827.

Lefroy (Sir J. H.). Memorials of Bermudas, 2 vols., 1877.

Marion (Phillips). A Colonial Autocracy. New South Wales under Governor Macquarie, 1810–21. 1909.

V. PEERAGE

Debrett (John). The Peerage of Great Britain and Ireland, 14th ed., 2 vols., 1816.

G. E. C. Complete Peerage of England, Scotland, Ireland, Great Britain and the United Kingdom, extant, extinct, or dormant; alphabetically arranged and edited by ——, 8 vols., 1887–98; new ed., V. Gibbs, revised and enlarged, vol. i., 1910 (in course of publication).

A first-rate genealogical authority.

Lawrence (Sir James). Of the Nobility of the English Gentry, 1825.

John Hampden, Junior. The Aristocracy of England; a history for the people, 1846.

For the orders of Knighthood, see

Nicolas (Sir N. H.). History of the Orders of Knighthood of the British Empire, 4 vols., 1841–2.

VI. THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

1. Official Documents

(i) *Composition of the Commons.*

Return. Members of Parliament. Part II, Parliaments of Great Britain, 1705–96; Parliaments of the United Kingdom, 1801–74; Parliaments and Conventions of the Estates of Scotland, 1357–1707; Parliaments of Ireland, 1559–1800. 1878.

To be supplemented by the following non-official works:

Smith (H. S.). The Parliaments of England from George I to present time, 3 vols., 1841.

—— The Register of Parliamentary Contested Elections, 1841.

(ii) *Special Reports and Returns.*

Weymouth and Melcombe Regis Election. Report on Election Petition, with special report on violation of the Treating Act and Abuses in splitting Freeholds, 1812–13.

Returns of Freeholders, registered in Ireland, 1802–3.

Accounts relating to 40s., £20 and £50 freeholders and rent-chargers registered; inhabitant householders registered; freemen admitted and sworn; and number of persons who polled at the last general election, in Ireland, 1824.

Returns of the number entitled to vote at county elections in Ireland, 1825.

Persons registered as freeholders, and admitted as freemen, within the last eight years, in Ireland, 1829.

2. General Works

The State of the Representation of England and Wales. Delivered to the Society, the Friends of the People, associated for the purpose of obtaining a Parliamentary Reform, on Saturday, February 9, 1793.

A Sketch of the various Proposals for a Constitutional Reform in the Representation of the People, introduced into the Parliament of Great Britain, from 1770 to 1812, by George Wilson Meadley . . . and Algernon Sydney, 1813. (See Pamphleteer. vol. ii, pp. 229 sqq.).

For complete lists see:

Oldfield (T. H. B.). The Representative History of Great Britain and Ireland being a History of the House of Commons and of the Counties, Cities and Boroughs of the United Kingdom, from the earliest period, 6 vols., 1816.

The standard authority.

Porritt (E). The Unreformed House of Commons: Parliamentary Representation before 1832 (vol. i England, vol. ii Scotland and Ireland), 1903.

A good compilation with a bibliography.

See also:

Redlich (Josef). Recht und Technik des englischen Parlamentarismus. Die Geschäftsordnung des House of Commons in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung und gegenwärtigen Gestalt, 1905. (English translation with an additional chapter by Sir Courtenay Ilbert, 3 vols., 1908.)

3. Works dealing with Local Representation

Wywill (Rev. Christopher). Political Papers, chiefly respecting the Attempt of the County of York, and other considerable districts, commenced in 1779, and continued during several subsequent years, to effect a Reformation of the Parliament of Great Britain, 4 vols. (no date); continued to 1811 in 2 vols. under the title: Political Papers comprising the Correspondence of several distinguished Persons in the years 1792–3.

Ferguson (R. S.). Cumberland and Westmorland M.P.'s from the Restoration to the Reform Bill of 1867 (1660–1867), 1871.

Williams (W. R.). The Parliamentary History of the Principality of Wales, from the earliest times to the present day (1541–1895), comprising lists of the representatives, chronologically arranged under counties, with biographical and genealogical notices of the members, together with particulars of the various contested elections, double returns and petitions, 1895.

—— The Parliamentary History of the County of Hereford, . . . from the earliest times to the Present day (1213–1896) with biographical and genealogical notices of the members, 1896.

——The Parliamentary History of the County of Worcester, . . . 1897.

—— The Parliamentary History of the County of Gloucester, . . . 1898.

—— Parliamentary History of the County of Oxford, . . . 1899.

VII. POLITICS OUTSIDE PARLIAMENT.

1. Electioneering.

Jephson (Henry). The Platform: its Rise and Progress, 2 vols., 1892.

Ostrogorski (A.). La Democratie et l'Organisation des Partis Politiques, 1st vol. (The 2nd deals with the United States of America.)

2. Journalism.

(i) *Official Documents.*

Stamps issued for Newspapers, with the amount of Duties charged thereon, 1814–15. 1822. The same from 1814 to 1824.

Weekly Newspapers published on Saturdays and Sundays, 1821.

Aggregate Number of Stamps issued for Newspapers in Great Britain, 1801 to 1826; also in Ireland, 1817 to 1826. 1826–7.

Return of the Ex-Officio Informations filed for Political Libel and Seditious Conduct in the Court of King's Bench in England since 1807, distinguishing those which have been followed up by Prosecution, and those which have not. 1821.

Prosecutions for Libel, Blasphemy and Sedition, 1813–22. 1823.

Prosecutions for Libel, etc.; a Return of all Prosecutions during the reigns of their late Majesties George III and George IV, either by Ex-Officio Information or Indictment, conducted in the Department of the Solicitor for the Affairs of His Majesty's Treasury. 1830.

(ii) *General.*

Hunt (F. K.). The Fourth Estate; contributions towards a history of newspapers and of the liberty of the Press, 2 vols., 1850.

Grant (James). The Newspaper Press: its Origin, Progress and present Position, 3 vols., 1871.

VIII. BIOGRAPHIES OF STATESMEN.

1. George III and his Court.

George the Third. The Correspondence of King —— with Lord North from 1768 to 1783, ed. W. B. Donne, 2 vols., 1867.

Burney (Frances ——, Madame d'Arblay). Diary and Letters of ——, ed. by her niece (Charlotte Barrett), 1st ed., 7 vols., 1842–6. We have used 2nd ed., 7 vols. 1854.

2. Histories of a more or less Biographical Character.

Lewis (Sir George Cornewall). Essays on the Administrations of Great Britain from 1783 to 1830, contributed to the Edinburgh Review, ed. Sir Edmund Head, 1864.

Brougham (Henry, Lord). Historical Sketches of Statesmen in the time of George III, 3 vols., 1839–43.

Fortescue (J. W.). British Statesmen of the Great War, 1793–1814. 1911.

3. Biographies, Memoirs, Correspondence.

(i) *The Party in Office.*

(*a*) General.

Kebbel (T. E.). History of Toryism, 1789–1881. 1886. Extremely superficial.

(*b*) Pitt.

Tomline (George). Memoirs of the Life of the Right Honourable William Pitt, 2 vols., 1821.
Stanhope (Earl). Life of the Right Honourable William Pitt, with extracts from his manuscript papers, 4 vols., 1861–2.
Rose (J. Holland). William Pitt and National Revival. 1911.
—— William Pitt and the Great War. 1911.

(*c*) Other Statesmen.

Abbott (Charles, first Lord Colchester). His Diary and Correspondence, ed. by his son Charles, Lord Colchester, 3 vols., 1861.
Addington (Henry ——, Viscount Sidmouth). The Life and Correspondence of ——, by George Pellew, 3 vols., 1847.
Canning, Life of ——, by H. M. V. Temperley, 1905.
Stapleton's work (The Political Life of Canning, etc., 1831) deals only with the last period of Canning's political life, 1822–7.
Croker. The —— Papers; The Correspondence and Diaries of . . . John Wilson Croker, . . . ed. by Louis J. Jennings, 3 vols., 1884.
Jenkinson (Robert Banks, second Earl of Liverpool). The Life and Administration of ——, by Charles Duke Yonge, 3 vols., 1868.
Peel (Sir Robert) —— from his private papers, . . . by Charles Stuart Parker, 3 vols., 1899.
Perceval (Right Hon. Spencer). The Life of the ——, by his grandson, Spencer Walpole, 1874.
Rose (Right Hon. George). Diaries and Correspondence, containing original letters of the most distinguished statesmen of his day, ed. by Leveson Vernon Harcourt, 2 vols., 1860.
Stewart (Robert, Lord Castlereagh). Memoirs and Correspondence, ed. by his brother Charles Vane, Marquess of Londonderry, 12 vols., 1848–53.
Temple (Henry John, Viscount Palmerston). The Life of ——, with selections from his Diaries and Correspondence, by the Right Hon. Sir Henry Lytton Bulwer, 3 vols., 1870–4.
Wellesley. Memoirs and Correspondence of the Most Noble Richard, Marquess ——, published by Robert Rouière Pearce, 3 vols., 1846.
The —— Papers. By the Editor of the Wyndham Papers, 2 vols., 1914.

Wilberforce (William). The Life of ——, by his sons, 5 vols., 1st ed., 1838.
—— Private Papers of ——, collected and edited, with a Preface, by A. M. Wilberforce, 1897.
Windham. The —— Papers, with an Introduction by the Earl of Rosebery, 2 vols., 1913.

(ii) *The Opposition.*

(*a*) Fox.

Russell (Lord John). Memorials and Correspondence of Charles James Fox, 4 vols., 1853–7.
—— The Life and Times of Charles James Fox, 3 vols., 1859–66.

(*b*) The Opposition as a Whole.

Fox (Henry Richard, third Baron Holland). Memoirs of the Whig Party during my Time, ed. by his son, Henry Edward, Lord Holland, 2 vols., 1852–4.
—— Further Memoirs of the Whig Party (1807–21), with some miscellaneous reminiscences, . . . ed. by Lord Stavordale, 1905.
Grenville (R. P., Duke of Buckingham). Memoirs of the Court and Cabinets of George the Third, from original family documents, 4 vols., 1853–5.
—— Memoirs of the Court of England during the Regency, 1811–20, from the original family documents, 2 vols., 1856.
Grey. Lord —— of the Reform Bill, by G. M. Trevelyan, 1920.
Holland (Elizabeth, Lady). The Journal of —— (1791–1811), ed. by the Earl of Ilchester, 2 vols., 1908.
Moore (Thomas). Memoirs, Journal and Correspondence of ——, ed. by . . . Lord John Russell, 8 vols., 1853–6.
Shelburne (William, Earl of ——, afterwards first Marquess of Lansdowne). Life of ——, with extracts from his papers and correspondence, 3 vols., 1875–6.
Sheridan (Richard Brinsley). Memoirs of the Life of the Right Hon. ——, by Thomas Moore, 2 vols., 1825.
—— from new and original material, including a manuscript diary of Georgiana, Duchess of Devonshire, by Walter Sichel, 2 vols., 1909.
Sydney Smith. A Memoir of the Rev. ——, by Lady S. Holland, with a selection from his letters, ed. by Miss Austin, 2 vols., 1st ed., 1855.
—— A Sketch of the Life and Times of the Rev. ——, . . . based on family documents and the recollections of personal friends, by Stuart J. Reid, 1844.

Also:

—— La rennaissance des idées liberales en Angleterre, par André Chevrillon, 1894.
Ward (John William, first Earl of Dudley). Letters of the Earl of Dudley to the Bishop of Llandaff, 1840.
—— Letters to Ivy (Helen d'Arcy Stewart), from the first Earl of Dudley, ed. by S. H. Romilly, 1905.

(iii) *The Radicals.*

(*a*) General.

Harris (William). The History of the Radical Party in Parliament. 1885.
Extremely superficial.
Kent (C. R.). The English Radicals, 1899.

(*b*) Biographies, Memoirs.

Cartwright (Major John). His Life and Correspondence, ed. by his niece, F. D. Cartwright, 2 vols., 1826.
Cobbett (William). A Study of His Life as shown in his Writings, by E. J. Carlyle. 1904.
—— The Life and Letters of William ——, in England and America; based upon hitherto unpublished family papers, by Lewis Melville, 2 vols., 1913.
Horne Tooke. Memoirs of John ——, interspersed with original documents, by Alexander Stephens, 2 vols., 1813.
Hunt (Henry). Memoirs, written by himself in His Majesty's Jail at Ilchester, 1820. Of very slight value.

BOOK II

THE ECONOMIC LIFE OF GREAT BRITAIN

I. GENERAL ACCOUNTS OF ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN GREAT BRITAIN.

Macpherson (David). Annals of Commerce, Manufactures, Fisheries and Navigation, with brief notes of the arts and sciences connected with them, containing the commercial transactions of the British Empire and other countries, from the earliest accounts to the meeting of the Union Parliament in January 1801, . . . 4 vols., 1805.
Colquhoun (P.). A Treatise on the Wealth, Power and Resources of the British Empire, etc., 1814.
Chalmers (G.). The State of the United Kingdom at the Peace of Paris, November 20, 1815; respecting the people, their domestic energies, their agriculture, their trade, their shipping, and their finances, 1816.
—— Comparative Views of the State of Great Britain and Ireland; as it was before the war, as it is since the peace, 1817.
Marshall (J.). Digest of all the accounts relating to the population, production, revenues, financial operations, manufactures, shipping, colonies, commerce, etc., of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, diffused through more than 600 volumes of journals, reports and papers presented to Parliament during the last thirty-five years, arranged by ——, 1834.
Moreau de Jonnès (A.). Statistique de la Grande-Bretagne et de l'Irlande, 1837–8.

Porter (G. R.). The Progress of the Nation in its various Social and Economic Relations from the Beginning of the Nineteenth Century, 1836–8; other eds., 1843, 1847, 1851.

Marx (Karl). Das Kapital, Kritik der Politischen Oekonomie, Buch I, 1st ed., 1867.

An account, richly furnished with illustrative material of the great industrial revolution, in which England is taken as the typical example of the great industrial state of modern times.

Held (A.). Zwei Bücher zur socialen Geschichte Englands. 1881.

Toynbee (Arnold). Lectures on the Industrial Revolution in England, with a Memoir by B. Jowett, 1884; new ed. with a Reminiscence by Lord Milner, 1908.

Mantoux (Paul). La Révolution Industrielle au XVIII^e siècle, Essai sur les Commencements de la Grande Industrie Moderne en Angleterre, 1906.

A first-rate account of the entire industrial revolution, with bibliography.

Cunningham (W.). The Growth of English Industry and Commerce in Modern Times. Vol. iii. Modern Times. Laissez-faire, 1907.

Smart (Professor William). Economic Annals of the 19th Century, 1801–20. 1910.

A useful collection of material bearing on economics, gathered from the Parliamentary Debates and the Annual Register.

II. AGRICULTURE.

A. ENGLAND.

1. Official Documents.

(i) *Parliamentary Reports.*

Reports from the Select Committee, appointed to inquire into the Corn Trade of the United Kingdom, 1812–13.

Report from the Select Committee to whom the several Petitions . . . upon the subject of the Corn Laws were referred, . . . 1813–14.

First and Second Reports from the Lord's Committee appointed to inquire into the State of the Growth, Commerce and Consumption of Grain and all Laws relating thereto, 1814–15.

Report on the Nature and Effect of the Game Laws, 1816.

(ii) *Publications by the Board of Agriculture.*

General Report on Enclosures, drawn up by order of the Board of Agriculture, 1808.

Agricultural State of the Kingdom, in February, March and April 1816, being the substance of the replies to a circular letter sent by the Board of Agriculture to every part of the Kingdom, 1816.

Marshall (W.). Review and Complete Abstract of the Reports of the Board of Agriculture, 1808–17.

2. Periodical Publications.

Annals of Agriculture, and other useful Arts, collected and published by Arthur Young, 46 vols., 1784–1815.

The Farmer's Magazine, a periodical work exclusively devoted to agricultural and rural affairs, 26 vols., 1800–25 (index).

3. Works dealing with the condition of English Agriculture, the Law of Landed Property, Technical Improvements, Enclosures, the Agricultural Labourer.

(i) *Contemporary Works.*

Howlett (John). An Inquiry into the Influence which Enclosures have had upon the Population of England. 1786.

—— Thoughts on Inclosure, by a Country Farmer. 1786.

Davies (David, of Barkham). Case of Labourers in Husbandry Stated and Considered, . . . 1795.

Young (Arthur). An Inquiry into the Propriety of Applying Wastes to the better Maintenance and Support of the Poor. 1801.

To which may be added:

Young (Arthur). An Inquiry into the Rise of Prices in Europe during the last Twenty-five Years, compared with that which has taken place in England; with observations on the effects of high and low prices. 1815.

Humphrey (James). Observations on the Actual State of the English Laws of Real Property, with the outlines of a code, 1st ed. 1827.

Also two works which, though dealing with a period slightly later than our own, afford a picturesque description of the English countryside.

Cobbett (William). Rural Rides, . . . 1st ed., 1830; 2nd ed., enlarged, 1853.

Howitt (William). The Rural Life of England, 1st ed., 1837; 2nd ed., 1840.

(ii) *The history of English agriculture at the end of the 18th century has recently been made the subject of a series of monographs, all of which repay study.*

Scrutton (Thomas Edward). Commons and Common Fields; or, the History and Policy of the Laws relating to Commons and Enclosures in England, 1887.

Prothero (Rowland E.). The Pioneers and Progress of English Farming, 1888.

Hasbach (Professor Wilhelm). Die englischen Landarbeiter in den letzten hundert Jahren und die Einhegungen, 1894. (English translation by Ruth Kenyon, 1908, with an excellent bibliography.)

Curtler (W. H. R.). A Short History of English Agriculture, 1909.

Johnson (A. H.). The Disappearance of the Small Landowner, 1909.
Davies (M. F.). Life in an English Village; an economic and historical survey of the parish of Corsley in Wiltshire, 1909.
Hammond (John Laurence Le Breton and Barbara). The Village Labourer, 1760–1832; a study in the government of England before the Reform Bill. 1911.
Gonner (E. C. K.). Common Land and Enclosure, 1912.

4. Biographies, Memoirs.

Sinclair (Sir John, Bart.). Memoirs of the Life and Works of the late Right Hon. ——, by the Rev. John Sinclair, 1837.
Young (Arthur). The Autobiography of ——, with selections from his correspondence, ed. Betham-Edwards, 1898.
Grey (John ——, of Dilston). Memoir of ——, by his daughter, Josephine E. Butler: revised ed., 1874.
Coke (Thomas William, of Holkham, first Earl of Leicester). Coke of Norfolk and his friends, the Life of ——, by A. M. W. Stirling, 1908.

B. SCOTLAND.

See especially:

Sinclair (Sir John). General Report of the Agricultural State and Political Circumstances of Scotland, drawn up for the consideration of the Board of Agriculture and Internal Improvement, under the directions of the Right Hon. ——, 5 vols., 1814.

Also,

Selkirk (Earl of). Observations on the Present State of the Highlands of Scotland, with a view of the Causes and probable Consequences of Emigration, 1805.

The following works, though of inferior merit, are worth consulting:

Stoddart (John). Remarks on the Local Scenery and Manners in Scotland during the Years 1799 and 1800. 1801.
Irvine (Alexander). An Inquiry into the causes and Effects of Emigration from the Highlands and Western Islands of Scotland, . . . 1802.
Brown (Robert). Strictures and Remarks on the Earl of Selkirk's Observations, . . . 1806.

C. IRELAND.

1. Official Documents.

Statement of the Nature and Extent of the Disturbances which have recently prevailed in Ireland, and Measures adopted in consequence thereof. 1816.
Minutes of Evidence, taken before the Select Committee in the last Session of Parliament, on the Disturbances in Ireland. 1825.

Minutes of Evidence, taken before the Select Committee appointed to examine into the Nature and Extent of the Disturbances which have prevailed in those Districts of Ireland which are now subject to the provisions of the Insurrection Act. 1825.

2. GENERAL.

The standard work is:

Wakefield (Edward). An Account of Ireland, Statistical and Political, 1812 (based on observations made in 1808–9).

But the student should also read:

Young (Arthur). A Tour in Ireland; with general observations on the present state of that kingdom, made in the years 1776–8, and brought down to the end of 1779. 1780–4.

Cooper (George). Letters on the Irish Nation; written during a visit to that Kingdom in the autumn of the year 1799. 1800.

Newenham (Thomas). A Statistical and Historical Inquiry into the Progress and Magnitude of the Population of Ireland, 1805; and: A View of the Natural, Political and Commercial Circumstances of Ireland. 1809.

Curwen (J. C.). Observations on the State of Ireland, Principally directed to its Agriculture and Rural Population, . . . 1818. (A collection of letters giving an account of a journey made in 1813.)

The Dublin Society, following the example set by the English Board of Agriculture, published seventeen reports on the economic conditions in the Irish counties; see especially:

Townshend (Rev. Horatio). Statistical Survey of the County of Cork, . . . 1810; 2nd ed., 1815.

Tighe (William). Statistical Observations Relative to the County of Kilkenny, . . . 1802.

Sigerson (George). History of the Land Tenures and Land Classes of Ireland, with an account of the various secret agrarian confederacies. 1871.

Elementary: but absolutely reliable.

Bonn (Dr. Moritz Julius). Die englische Kolonisation in Irland, 1896.

Valuable both for its solid foundation of material, and the original interpretation of the facts collected.

III. INDUSTRY.

A. MINES.

1. COAL.

(i) *Official Documents.*

Report on the State of the Coal Trade, 1800.

(ii) *Monographs.*

Gisborne (Rev. Thomas). A General View of the Situation of the Mining Poor, compared with that of some other Classes

of the Poor, 1798. (Reports of the Society for Bettering the Condition of the Poor, vol. i, pp. 368 sqq.)
Dixon (Joshua). The Literary Life of William Brownrigg, 1801.
Holmes (J. H. H.). A Treatise on the Coal Mines of Durham and Northumberland, . . . 1816.
Nelson Boyd (R.). Coal Pits and Pitmen; a short history of the coal trade and the legislation affecting it, 1872.
Fynes (Richard). The Miners of Northumberland and Durham, a History of their Social and Political Struggles. . . . 1873.
Galloway (Robert L.). Annals of Coal Mining and the Coal Trade, the Invention of the Steam Engine and the Origin of the Railway, 1898.
—— Papers relating to the History of the Coal Trade and the Invention of the Steam Engine, . . . 1906.
Jevons (H. Stanley). The British Coal Trade, 1915.

2. Copper, Tin, Lead.

(i) *Official Documents.*

Report on the State of the Copper Mines and Copper Trade, 1799.

(ii) *General Works.*

Hunt (Robert). British Mining; a treatise on the history, discovery, practical development and future prospects of metalliferous mines in the United Kingdom, 1884; 2nd ed. revised, 1887.

(iii) *Monographs.*

(*a*) Copper and Tin.

An Address to the Gentlemen of the County of Cornwall on the Present State of Mining in that County, . . . 1772.
Myce (W.). Mineralogia Cornubiensis; a treatise on minerals, mines and mining, . . . 1778.
Contains a detailed account of the organization of labour in the mines.
A Brief Address on Mining in Cornwall, demonstrating some of the advantages resulting to commerce, and the profit to capitalists, by investment in those national undertakings; by the Secretary to the Kellewerris and West Tresavean Mining Companies. 1835.

(*b*) Lead.

Hardy (William). The Miner's Guide; or, Compleat Miner, containing I . . . II, The Customs, Laws, and Articles of the High and Low Peak, . . . 1748.
Hall (Frederick). An Appeal to the Poor Miner and to every Nobleman, Gentleman and Tradesman in the Kingdom, who feels interested in a Miner's Fate, 1818.

B. METAL WORKING.

Gibbons (William). A reply to Sir Lucius O'Brien, Baronet; in which that part of his letter to the author which most particularly respects the present state of the Iron Trade between England and Ireland is considered. 1785.

[Needham (M.)]. Library of Useful Knowledge. Manufacture of Iron. 1831.

Scrivenor (H.). A Comprehensive History of the Iron Trade throughout the World, from the earliest records to the present period, . . . 1841.

Hall (John). The Iron Trade, with remarks, pointing out the true cause and cure for its existing state of depression. 1843.

Wilkie (George). The Manufacture of Iron in Great Britain; with remarks on the employment of capital in ironworks and collieries. 1857.

Jeans (J. S.). Steel: its History, Manufacture, Properties and Uses. 1880.

Fell (Alfred). The early Iron Industry of Furness and District; an historical and descriptive account from the earliest times to the end of the 18th century, with an account of Furness ironmasters in Scotland (1726–1800). 1908.

C. MANUFACTURE OF MACHINERY AND TOOLS, THE TOY TRADE, HARDWARE, CUTLERY.

We can utilize:

1. A Number of Local Histories.

Pye (Charles). A Description of Modern Birmingham; whereunto are annexed observations made during an excursion round the town in the summer of 1818, including Warwick and Leamington [1820].

Hutton (William). The History of Birmingham; continued to the present time by Catherine Hutton, 4th ed. 1819.

Langford (John Alfred). A Century of Birmingham Life; or, a chronicle of local events, from 1741 to 1841, compiled and ed. by ——. 1868.

Hunter (Joseph). Hallamshire, the History and Topography of the Parish of Sheffield in the County of York; with historical and descriptive notices of the parishes of Ecclesfield, Hansworth, Treeton and Whiston, and of the Chapelry of Bradfield, 1819; new ed., enlarged, by A. Gatty, 1869.

2. A Few Biographies.

Smiles (Samuel). Industrial Biography: Ironworkers and Toolmakers, new ed., 1879;

And several other biographies by the same author, which will be given below under "Transport."

D. TEXTILE MANUFACTURES.

1. Cotton, Silk and Wool.

Taylor (W. Cooke). Handbook of Silk, Cotton and Woollen Manufactures, 1843.

2. Cotton.

(1) *Official Documents.*

Minutes of Evidence taken before the Select Committee, to whom the Petitions presented to the House in this Session relating to Acts 39 and 40 Geo. III, "for settling disputes between Masters and Workmen engaged in the Cotton Manufacture, were referred," 1802–3.

Report from the Select Committee appointed to consider of the most speedy and effectual mode of adjusting such differences as may arise between Masters and Workmen engaged in the Cotton Manufacture, . . . 1803–4.

Minutes of Evidence taken before the Select Committee to whom the Petition of Journeymen Calico Printers in the counties of Leicester, Derby, Chester and Stafford, in England, and in the counties of Lanark, Renfrew, Dumbarton, Stirling and Perth, in Scotland, was referred, 1803–4.

Report from the Select Committee to whom it was referred to examine into the matter of the Minutes of Evidence taken before the foregoing Committee, 1806.

Report from the Committee on Petitions of several Cotton Manufacturers and Journeymen Cotton Weavers, together with the Minutes of Evidence, . . . 1808.

Report on the Cotton Weavers' Petition, 1809.

Report from the Committee on Dr. Cartwright's Petition respecting his Weaving Machine, together with the Minutes of Evidence, . . . 1808.

Report from the Select Committee to whom the Petition of Richard Ainsworth, of Bolton (Lancaster), Cotton Manufacturer, and that of Journeymen Cotton Weavers resident in England, were severally referred. 1808.

Report from the Select Committee to whom the Petition of several Journeymen Cotton Weavers resident in England, that of the Cotton Manufacturers and Operative Weavers in Scotland, and the foregoing Report were severally referred. 1809.

Report from the Select Committee to whom the Petition of Manufacturers and Artisans in Manchester, that of Weavers and Spinners of Cotton, Handicraft, Artists and Labourers, resident in Bolton (Lancaster); those of persons residing in Paisley, and of Heritors, Manufacturers, Merchants, Mechanics and Labourers resident in Lancaster, Ayr and Renfrewshire were referred. 1810–11.

The following works on factory legislation are confined, so far as our period is concerned, to the cotton industry:

Report of the Minutes of Evidence taken before the Select Committee on the State of the Children employed in the Manufactories of the United Kingdom. 1816.

Report from the Select Committee to whom the Bill to regulate the Labour of Children in Mills and Factories of the United Kingdom was referred. 1831–2.

First Report of the Central Board of His Majesty's Commissioners, appointed to collect information in the manufacturing districts, relative to the Employment of Children in Factories and as to the propriety and means of curtailing the hours of their labour, with Minutes of Evidence and Reports of District Commissioners. 1833.

(ii) *Monographs.*

Kennedy (John). Observations on the Rise and Progress of the Cotton Trade in Great Britain . . . (in Memoirs of the Literary and Philosophical Society of Manchester, 2nd series, vol. iii. 1819).

Guest (Richard). A Compendious History of the Cotton Manufacture; with a disproval of the claim of Sir Richard Arkwright to the invention of its ingenious machinery. 1823.

Radcliffe (William). Origin of the new System of Manufacture, commonly called "Power Loom Weaving," and the Purposes for which this System was Invented and brought into Use; fully explained in a narrative, containing William Radcliffe's struggle through life to remove the cause which has brought this country to its present crisis, written by himself. 1828.

Gaskell (P.). The Manufacturing Population of England, . . . 1833.

—— Artisans and Machinery; the moral and physical condition of the manufacturing population considered, with reference to mechanical substitutes for human labour. 1836.

A second and enlarged edition of the preceding. It deals exclusively with the cotton industry.

Baines (Edward). History of the Cotton Manufacture in Great Britain . . . (1835).

—— History of the County Palatine and Duchy of Lancaster, 4 vols., 1836.

Ure (A.). The Cotton Manufacture of Great Britain, systematically investigated, 1836.

Schulze-Gaevernitz (G. von). Der Grossbetrieb, ein wissenschaftlicher und socialer Fortschritt, 1892.

This work deals only with the cotton industry.

Daniels (George A.). The early English Cotton Industry, with some unpublished letters of Samuel Crompton; Introductory chapter by George Unwin, 1920.

Also the two following works on the history of factory legislation:

Plener (Ernest Edler von). Die englische Fabrikgesetzgebung (English translation, 1873).

Hutchins (B. L.) and Harrison (A.) A History of Factory Legislation, with a Preface by Sidney Webb. 1903.

For the condition of labour see the important statistical work of:

Wood (G. W.). History of Wages in the Cotton Trade during the past Hundred Years. 1910.
This work forms part of a larger work on the fluctuation of wages in British industry during the 19th century, which has been published in the Journal of the Royal Statistical Society.

See, finally, for a complete and vivid picture of the Lancashire cotton industry, its employers and factory hands, and of the factory legislation, the excellent work of:

Owen (Robert). The Life of ——, written by himself, with selections from his writings and correspondence, vol. i. (the only volume ever published). 1857.

3. Wool.

(i) *Official Documents.*

Report from the Select Committee on the Petition of persons concerned in the Woollen Trade and Manufactures in the counties of Somerset, Wilts and Gloucester, 1802–3.

Report from the Select Committee on the Petitions of Merchants and Manufacturers concerned in the Woollen Manufacture in the county of York and town of Halifax (York), 1802–3.

Report of the Select Committee on the Petition of the Manufacturers of Woollen Cloth in the county of York, 1803–4.

Minutes of Evidence taken before the Committee, to whom the Bill, respecting the Laws relating to the Woollen Trade, is committed, 1803.

Report and Minutes of Evidence, on the State of the Woollen Manufacture in England, and the Use of Machinery, 1806.
A document of the first importance.

(ii) *General.*

Hirst (W.). History of the Woollen Trade during the last Sixty Years. 1844.

James (J.). History of the Worsted Manufacture in England from the Earliest Times. 1857.

Dechesne (J.). L'Evolution Economique et Sociale de l'Industrie de la Laine en Angleterre. 1900.

Lipson (E.). English Woollen and Worsted Industries. 1920.

4. Silk.

For this manufacture, which was in a state of decline, no general work exists, but a few official documents are at the student's disposal:

Report from Committee on Silk Ribbon Weavers' Petitions, 1818.

First and Second Reports of Minutes of Evidence taken before the Committee appointed to consider of the several Petitions relating to Ribbon Weavers, 1818.

5. Linen.

Warden (A. J.). The Linen Trade, Ancient and Modern, 1st ed., 1864; 2nd ed., 1867.

E. HOSIERY.

1. Official Documents.

Report on Framework Knitters' Petitions, complaining of the deceitful manufacture of goods. 1812.

Second Report on the same subject, and describing the different modes of making stockings. 1812.

Report and Minutes of Evidence of Framework Knitters, on their Petition, respecting the mode of manufacturing stockings. 1819.

2. General.

Felkin (W.). History of the Machine-wrought Hosiery and Lace Manufactures. 1869.

A work of considerable interest; the author was a manufacturer who had taken a personal share in the suppression of labour riots.

See also:

Blackner (John). The History of Nottingham, embracing its antiquities, trade and manufactures, from the earliest authentic records to the present time. 1815.

F. TRANSPORT; MEANS OF COMMUNICATION.

1. Official Documents.

(i) *Roads.*

Reports on the state of the Highways, 1808–21 (7 reports).

(ii) *Navigation.*

British and Foreign Vessels and Tonnage, and number of men and boys employed in navigating the same in the several ports of Great Britain, 1810–12.

British and Foreign Tonnage, and number of foreign seamen and vessels entered inwards and cleared outwards at the ports of the United Kingdom, 1812.

Vessels entered and cleared in Great Britain, 1812.

British and Foreign Vessels and Tonnage, and number of men and boys. . . . 1817.

British and Foreign Vessels, with their Tonnage, and number of men and boys employed in navigating the same, entered inwards and cleared outwards at the several ports of Great Britain, from or to all parts of the world, 1817.

2. General.

Dupin (Baron Charles). Voyages dans la Grande-Bretagne, 2nd ed., Part III. Force Commerciale. Section des Travaux Publics et d'Association. Voies publiques, Places, Rues, Routes, Canaux, Ponts et Chaussées, 2 vols. 1826.

Phillips (J.) A General History of Inland Navigation, Foreign and Domestic; containing a complete account of the canals already executed in England, with considerations on those projected, . . . 1792.

Lindsay (W.S.). History of Merchant Shipping and Ancient Commerce, 4 vols. 1874–6.
(Vol. ii. extremely superficial.)

3. Biographies.

Smiles (Samuel). Lives of the Engineers, new and revised ed.; vol. i, Harbours, Lighthouses, Bridges; . . . vol. ii, History of Roads; . . . vol. iii, The Steam Engine; . . . vol. iv, The Locomotive, 1874.

—— The Life of George Stephenson, Railway Engineer, 5th ed., 1858.

G. THE EMPLOYERS.

1. The Organization of British Industry.

Observations on Public Institutions, Monopolies, Joint-Stock Companies, and Deeds of Trust; showing the advantages the public derive from Competition in Trade, . . . 1807.

Joint-Stock Companies with Transferable Shares: Report of the Arguments, upon the application to the Court of King's Bench, for leave to file an Information against Mr. Ralph Dodd, upon the Statute of 6 Geo. I, cap. 18. 1808.

Levy (Hermann). Monopole, Kartelle und Trusts in ihren Beziehungen zur Organisation der Kapitalistischer Industrie; Dargestellt an der Entwicklung in Grossbritannien, 1909.

2. Commerce and Commercial Policy: Orders in Council: Blockade of the Continent.

(i) *Official Documents.*

(*a*) Tariffs.

Mascall (E. J.). A Practical Book of Customs, with Excise, upon all Foreign Articles Imported. 1801.

—— A Digest of the Duties of Customs and Excise, etc.; the whole brought up to July 5, 1809. 1809.

(*b*) Imports and Exports: Statistics.

An Account of the real value of Exports from Great Britain in the years, 1805, 1806, 1807, 1803, 1809, 1810, 1811 respectively, distinguishing generally the countries to which the goods were exported, 1812.

An Account of the real value of exports from Great Britain to all parts of the world, in the years 1805, 1806, 1807, 1808, 1809,

1810 and 1811 respectively, distinguishing British Produce and Manufactures from Foreign and Colonial Merchandise; distinguishing the Amount to the North of Europe, to Spain, to Portugal, to other Parts of Europe, to Asia, to Africa, to the United States of America, and to all other parts of America, 1812.

An Account of the Imports and Exports of all Merchandise of Great Britain, to and from Foreign Countries; in the years ending January 5, 1792, 1804 and 1814; distinguishing the Official from the Real Value, 1814.

An Account of the Official Value of the Exports from Great Britain, in each year from 1792 to 1816, both inclusive; distinguishing the value of British Produce and Manufactures, from that of Foreign and Colonial Merchandise, 1817.

(*c*) Orders in Council.

Minutes of Evidence taken at the Bar of the House upon taking into consideration the Petition of several Merchants in Liverpool, and also the Petition of several Merchants and Manufacturers of Manchester who are extensively concerned in the trade to the United States of North America, respecting the Orders in Council, 1808; reprinted 1812.

Minutes of Evidence, taken before the Committee of the whole House, to whom it was referred to consider of the several Petitions which have been presented to the House in the Session of Parliament relating to Orders in Council. 1812.

(ii.) *Contemporary Works; the Controversy occasioned by the Orders in Council.*

Stephen (John). War in Disguise, or the Frauds of Neutral Flags. 1805.

Spence (William). Britain Independent of Commerce. 1807.

Mill (James). Commerce Defended, . . . 1807; 2nd ed., 1808. Bosanquet (Charles). Thoughts on the Value, to Great Britain,

of Commerce in General, and on the Value and Importance of the Colonial Trade in Particular. 1808.

Chalmers (Thomas). An Inquiry into the Extent and Stability of National Resources. 1808.

Phillimore (J.). Reflections on the Nature and Extent of the Licence Trade. 1811.

West (Sir Edward). Letter on the Licence Trade. 1812.

3. The East India Company.

(i) *Official Documents.*

Minutes of Evidence respecting the Renewal of the Company's Charter, 1812–13.

4. Protection of Agriculture; the Corn Laws.

(i) *Official Documents.*

The reports enumerated above, under "Agriculture."

(ii) *Contemporary Works.*

Malthus (T. R.). Observations on the Effects of the Corn Laws, and of a Rise or Fall in the Price of Corn on the Agriculture and General Wealth of the Country, 1814.

[West (Sir Edward)]. Essay on the Application of Capital to Land; with observations showing the impolicy of any great restriction on the importation of corn, . . . by a Fellow of University College, Oxford. 1815.

Malthus (T. R.). An Inquiry into the Nature and Progress of Rent, and the Principles by which it is Regulated. 1815.

—— The Grounds of an Opinion on the Policy of Restricting the Importation of Foreign Corn. . . . 1815.

Ricardo (D.). An Essay on the Influence of a Low Price of Corn on the Profits of Stock; showing the inexpediency of restrictions on importations, . . . with remarks on Mr. Malthus' two last publications. . . . 1815.

5. General.

Levi (Leone). The History of British Commerce and of the Economic Progress of the British Nation, 1763–1878. 1880.

Rose (John Holland). England's Commercial Struggle with Napoleon. . . . 1902.

Cunningham (Aubrey). British Credit in the last Napoleonic War. . . . 1910.

H. THE PROLETARIATE.

1. Organization: Standard Works.

Brentano (Lujo). On the History and Development of Gilds, and the Origin of Trade Unions. 1870.

Webb (Sidney and Beatrice). The History of Trade Unionism. 1896.

Howell (George). Labour Legislation, Labour Movements and Labour Leaders. 1902.

2. Poverty.

Eden (Sir F. M.). The State of the Poor, or a history of the labouring classes in England, from the Conquest to the present period, 3 vols., 1797.

Colquhoun (P.). A Treatise on Indigence; exhibiting a general view of the national resources for productive labour. . . . 1806.

And the two more recent volumes, at once scholarly and impassioned:

Hammond (J. L. and Barbara). The Town Labourer (1760–1832). The New Civilisation, 1917.

—— The Skilled Labourer (1760–1832), 1919.

3. Labour Troubles, the Luddites; a few Official Documents.

Report of the Committee of Secrecy on Papers relating to certain violent Proceedings in several Counties of England. 1812.
Proceedings at York Special Commission (January 2–12, 1813). 1813.
The Trials of all the Prisoners at the Special Assizes for the County of Lancaster, commencing May 23, 1812.
Charlotte Brontë's novel, Shirley. 1849.
An historical source for the riots in Yorkshire.

IV. CREDIT.

1. The Banking System.

(i) *Official Documents.*

An Account of the Number of Country Banks in England and Wales for which Licences to issue Promissory Notes have been taken out in each Year, from 1808 to 1818. . . . 1819.

(ii) *General.*

Macleod (H. D.). The Theory and Practice of Banking, 2 vols., 1st ed., 1855–6; 5th ed., 1892–3.
Bagehot (W.). Lombard Street; a description of the Money Market. 1873.
Rae (George). The Country Banker: his Clients, Cares and Work, from an experience of forty years. 1885.
Lawson (W. J.). The History of Banking; with a comprehensive account of the origin, rise and progress of the banks of England, Ireland and Scotland, 1st ed., 1852; 2nd ed., enlarged, 1855.
Kerr (A. W.). History of Banking in Scotland, 1884.

Two works by

Francis (John). History of the Bank of England, its Times and Traditions. 1847.
—— Chronicles and Characters of the Stock Exchange. 1849.
Primarily collections of anecdotes.

(iii) *Monographs, Biographies.*

Forbes (Sir William). Memoirs of a Banking House. 1860.
Hughes (L.). Liverpool Banks and Bankers, 1760–1837. 1905.

2. Suspension of Cash Payments, Financial Crises, their Explanation.

(i) *Official Documents.*

Report, together with Minutes of Evidence and Accounts, from the Select Committee appointed to inquire into the cause of the High Price of Gold Bullion, . . . 1810.
First and Second Reports from the Committee of Secrecy appointed to consider of the State of the Bank of England, with refer-

ence to the expediency of the Resumption of Cash Payments at the period fixed by law. 1819.

First and Second Reports by the Lords' Secret Committee, appointed to inquire into the same subject. 1819.

(ii) *Contemporary Controversy.*

The Iniquity of Banking; or banknotes proved to be an injury to the public, and the real cause of the present exorbitant price of provisions, 2nd ed., 1797.

The Utility of Country Banks considered. 1802.

Thornton (Henry). An Inquiry into the Nature and Effects of the Paper Credit of Great Britain. 1802.

Guineas an Unnecessary and Expensive Incumbrance on Commerce; or, the impolicy of repealing the Bank Restriction Bill considered. 2nd ed., with an Appendix, 1803.

King (Peter, seventh Lord King). Thoughts on the Effects of the Bank Restrictions, 1st ed., 1803; 2nd ed., enlarged, 1804.

Bosanquet (Charles). Practical Observations on the Report of the Bullion Committee. 1st ed., 1810; 2nd ed., enlarged, 1810.

Ricardo (David). High Price of Bullion a Proof of the Depreciation of Bank Notes. 1811.

—— Reply to Mr. Bosanquet's Practical Observations on the Report of the Bullion Committee. 1811.

A pamphlet which appeared in 1811, entitled:

Resolutions proposed to the House of Commons on the Report of the Committee appointed to inquire into the High Price of Bullion, by Francis Horner and the Right Hon. N. Vansittart, also the several divisions which took place in consequence of the same ——, to which is added, a list of publications occasioned by the Report of the Committee. 1811.

Contains a list of 60 works, which appeared between 1802 and 1811.

Cobbett (William). Paper against Gold; containing the History and Mystery of the Bank of England, the funds, the debt, the sinking fund, the bank stoppage, the lowering and the raising of the value of paper-money; and showing that taxation, pauperism, poverty, misery and crimes have all increased, and ever must increase, with a funding system. 1817.

A collection of articles from the Political Register, 1810–11.

(iii) *General Works, worthy of mention, are:*

Tooke (Thomas). A History of Prices and of the State of the Circulation from 1793 to 1837. 1838.

Juglar (Clément). Des Crises Commerciales et de leur retour périodique en France, en Angleterre at aux États-Unis, 1st ed., 1862; 2nd ed., 1889.

V. NATIONAL FINANCE.

A. GENERAL.

Pebrer (Pablo). Taxation, Revenue, Expenditure, Power, Statistics and Debt of the whole British Empire; their origin, progress and present state, with an estimate of the capital and resources of the Empire and a practical plan for applying them to the liquidation of the National Debt; the whole founded on, and illustrated by, official tables, and authentic documents. 1833.

Doubleday (Thomas). A Financial, Monetary and Statistical History of England, from the Revolution of 1688 to the present time; derived principally from official documents. In seventeen letters addressed to the young men of Great Britain, 1847.

Extremely superficial.

B. THE NATIONAL DEBT.

1. Official Documents.

Total amount of money raised in each year from 1790 to 1815; sums issued on account of the interest of the National Debt, the reduction of the National Debt, or of general expenditure; capital of funded and unfunded debt. 1814–15.

2. Contemporary Controversy.

Paine (Thomas). The Decline and Fall of the English System of Finance. 1796.

Morgan (William). Facts addressed to the Serious Attention of the People of Great Britain respecting the Expense of the War, and the State of the National Debt. 1796.

—— Additional Facts Addressed, etc. 1796.

—— An Appeal to the People of Great Britain on the Alarming State of the Public Finances and of Public Credit. 1797.

—— A Comparative View of the Public Finances from the Beginning to the Close of the Late Administration. 1801.

Gentz (Frédéric). Essai sur l'état actuel de l'Administration des Finances et de la Richesse Nationale de la Grande-Bretagne. 1800.

Grellier (J. J.). The Terms of all the Loans which have been raised for the Public Service during the last Fifty Years; with an Introductory account of the principal loans prior to that period. 1799.

—— The History of the National Debt, from 1688 to the Beginning of 1800; with a preliminary account of the debts contracted previous to the era. 1810.

Hamilton (Robert). An Inquiry Concerning the rise and Progress, the Redemption and Present State, and the Management,

of the National Debt of Great Britain, 1st ed., 1813; 2nd ed., enlarged, 1814; 3rd ed., further enlarged, 1818.
The standard authority on the subject.

Ricardo (David). Essay on the Funding System, 1820 (published in the supplement to the 6th ed. of the Encyclopædia Britannica . . . Works, ed. MacCulloch, pp. 513 sqq.).

C. TAXATION.

1. Official Documents.

In addition to the large collection of annual budgets we may mention the following Parliamentary papers:

Gross and net produce of revenue collected in England and Scotland during fourteen years, ending 1815; also, gross and net produce of war taxes during the like period, 1814–15.

An account or estimate of the gross and net assessments of the Property Tax for five years, ending April 5, 1814, distinguishing the several classes: annual value of lands, tenements and hereditaments; and duty arising from profits of professions, trades and offices, 1814–15.

2. General.

Sinclair (Sir John). The History of the Public Revenue of the British Empire, 1785; Part II, 1789; Part III, 1790; 3rd ed., 3 vols., 1803–4.

Dowell (Stephen). A History of Taxation in England from the Earliest Times to the Present Day. 1st ed., 1884; 2nd ed., 1888.

—— A History and Explanation of the Stamp Duties; containing remarks on the origin of stamp duties, a history of the duties in this country from their commencement to the present time. . . . 1873.

D. RATES: THE POOR LAW.

1. Offical Documents.

Local Taxation, Poor Rates, County Rates, Highway Rates, Church Rates, . . . 1839.

Report from the Committee on Poor Houses and Poor Rates, 1813.

Report from the Select Committee on the Poor Laws, with the Minutes of Evidence, . . . 1817.

2. Contemporary Controversy on the Administration of the Poor Law.

In addition to the works, already mentioned, of Sir F. M. Eden and Colquhoun (p. 545), see

Malthus (T. R.). An Essay on the Principle of Population, . . .

1st ed., 1798; 2nd ed., enlarged, 1803; 3rd ed., 2 vols., 1807; 5th ed., 1817; 6th ed., 1826.

Rose (Right Hon. George). Observations on the Poor Laws and on the Management of the Poor in Great Britain. . . . 1805.

—— Observations on Banks for Savings. 1816.

Weyland, (John). Observations on Mr. Whitbread's Poor Bill, and on the Population of England; intended as a supplement to a short inquiry into the policy, humanity and past effects of the Poor Laws, 1807.

—— The Principle of the English Poor Laws, illustrated from the evidence given by Scottish Proprietors (before the Corn Committee), on the connection observed in Scotland between the price of grain and the wages of labour. 1815.

Clark (William). Thoughts on the Management and Relief of the Poor; on the causes of their increase, and on the measures that may be best calculated to amend the former, and check the latter. 1815.

3. General.

Nicholls (Sir George). A History of the English Poor Law, in connection with the legislation and other circumstances affecting the condition of the people. 1854.

—— A History of the Scotch Poor Law, in connection with the condition of the people, 1856.

—— A History of the Irish Poor Law, in connection, . . . 1856.

BOOK III

RELIGION AND CULTURE

I. RELIGION.

A. GENERAL.

Hunt (John). Religious Thought in England, from the Reformation to the End of the Last Century, . . . 3 vols., 1870–3.
A summary of the religious doctrines taught during this period; vol. iii deals with the 18th century.

Haweis (Rev. T.). An Impartial and Succinct History of the Rise, Declension, and Revival of the Church of Christ; from the birth of our Saviour to the present time, with faithful characters of the principal personages. 1800.
Vol. iii. Evangelical.

Timpson (Rev. T.). British Ecclesiastical History; including the religion of the Druids, the introduction of Christianity into Britain, and the rise, progress and present state of every denomination of Christians in the British Empire. 1838.
Nothing more than a textbook. But the portion of the work which deals with the 18th and 19th centuries is founded on a rich collection of material.

Stoughton (John). Religion in England from 1800 to 1850; a history, with a postscript on subsequent events, 2 vols., 1884.

B. THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

1. Ecclesiastical Law.

Burn (Richard). Ecclesiastical Law, 1st ed., 1763; 7th ed., in 4 vols., 1809.

2. Official Documents.

Abstracts, presented to the House of Commons, of Returns relative to the Clergy; also further Papers respecting Non-Residence. 1808.

Abstracts, presented to the House of Commons, of Returns made to the Privy Council of Great Britain by the several Archbishops and Bishops, relative to the Residence of the Clergy in their respective Dioceses, in the years 1804, 1805, 1806, 1807 and 1808. 1809.

An Abstract of Returns respecting Non-Residence for the year ending March 25, 1808, including only Livings under the value of £150 per annum. 1810.

An Abstract of Returns respecting Non-Residence for the year ending March 25, 1809. 1812.

Abstract of the Number and Classes of Non-Resident Incumbents, and of the Number of Resident Incumbents, according to the Diocesan Returns for the year 1810. 1812.

Abstract of the Number of Resident and Licensed Curates, with the amount of the Salaries of Curacies, according to the Diocesan Returns for the year 1810. 1812.

Abstract of the Number of Resident and Licensed Curates, with the amount of the Salaries of Curacies, according to the Diocesan Returns for the year 1811. 1812–13.

Abstract of the total Number of Parishes in each Diocese in England and Wales, containing a Population of 1,000 Persons and upwards; the number of Churches and Chapels therein; the number of persons they will contain; and the number of Dissenting Places of Worship therein. 1812.

Report of the Commissioners, appointed by His Majesty to inquire into the Ecclesiastical Revenues of England and Wales. 1835.

3. Contemporary Publications.

A Report from the Clergy of a District in the Diocese of Lincoln, convened for the purpose of considering the state of religion in the several Parishes of the said District. 1800.

Cove (Rev. Morgan). An Essay on the Revenues of the Church of England; with an inquiry into the necessity, justice and policy of an abolition or commutation of tithes, 1st and 2nd ed., 1797; 3rd ed., 1816.

Cockburn (Rev. W.). Strictures on Clerical Education in the University of Cambridge, 1809.

The State of the Established Church; in a series of letters to the Right Hon. Spencer Perceval, Chancellor of the Exchequer, 2nd ed., 1810.

4. GENERAL.

Abbey (Charles J.) and Overton (John H.). The English Church in the Eighteenth Century, 2 vols., 1878.

Overton (John H.). The English Church in the Nineteenth Century (1800–33). 1894.

Works full of information and usually safe guides, though the authors, two High Churchmen, are not absolutely impartial.

Cornish (F. Warre). History of the English Church in the Nineteenth Century. 2 vols., 1910.

Mathieson (William Law). English Church Reform (1815–40). 1924.

5. BIOGRAPHIES, MEMOIRS, CORRESPONDENCE.

Jebb (John) and Knox (Alexander). Thirty Years' Correspondence Between ——, ed. Forster, 2 vols., 1834.

Jebb (John). Life of ——, Bishop of Limerick, by Charles Forster. 1851.

But practically all the outstanding figures of Anglicanism in the opening years of the 19th century were Evangelicals. For their biographies see the following section.

C. THE EVANGELICAL PARTY.

1. CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

Gisborne (Thomas). An Inquiry into the Duties of Men in the Higher Rank and Middle Classes of Society in Great Britain, 1st ed., 1797; 2nd ed., 2 vols., 1795.

Contains very little theology; a useful book for the study of social life.

Wilberforce (William). A Practical View of the Prevailing Religious System of Professed Christians in the Higher and Middle Classes in this Country, contrasted with Real Christianity, 1797, 15th ed., 1824.

May be regarded as the party manifesto. It provoked a war among the theologians. *See especially :*

Daubeny (Charles). A Guide to the Church; in several discourses, to which are added two postscripts: the first to those members of the Church who occasionally frequent other places of public worship, the second to the clergy, Addressed to William Wilberforce, Esq., M.P., 1798.

High Church.

Hill (Sir Richard). An Apology for Brotherly Love and for the Doctrines of the Church of England, in a series of letters to the Rev. Charles Daubeny. 1798.

Evangelical.

Overton (John). The true Churchman Ascertained; or an apology for those of the Regular Clergy of the Establishment who are sometimes called Evangelical Ministers, . . . 1801.

Evangelical.

Daubeny (Rev. Charles). Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ; in which some of the false reasonings, incorrect statements, and palpable misrepresentations in a publication entitled The True Churchman, by John Overton, A.B., are pointed out. 1803

High Church.

[Bean (Rev. James)]. Zeal without Innovation; or, the Present State of Religion and Morals Considered. 1808.

A moderate criticism of the Evangelicals.

———

Marsh (Herbert). An Inquiry into the Consequences of Neglecting to Give the Prayer Book with the Bible, interspersed with remarks on some late speeches at Cambridge and other important matter relative to the British and Foreign Bible Society. 1812.

Otter (Rev. William). A Vindication of Churchmen who become Members of the British and Foreign Bible Society, in a letter to a friend at Cambridge; being an answer to Dr. Marsh's pamphlet upon that subject. 1812.

Milner (Rev. I.). Strictures on some of the Publications of the Rev. Herbert Marsh, D.D., intended as a reply to his objections against the British and Foreign Bible Society. 1813.

2. General.

Overton (John Henry). The Evangelical Revival in the Eighteenth Century, 1886; new ed., 1900.

Stock (Eugene). The History of the Church Missionary Society: its environment, its men and its work. For the period before 1848, see vol. i. 1899.

Owen (Rev. John). The History of the Origin and First Ten Years of the British and Foreign Bible Society. 2 vols., 1816.

Canton (William). A History of the British and Foreign Bible Society. For the period before 1834, see vol. i. 1904.

3. Biographies.

Stephen (Right Hon. Sir James). Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography and other Subjects. 1st ed., 1849.

Colquhoun (J. C.). William Wilberforce: his friends and his times, 1866.

These two biographies taken together present a picture of the Evangelical party as a body. The former is authoritative.

Milner (Isaac). The Life of ——, . . . by Mary Milner, 1842.
More (Mrs. Hannah). Memoirs of the Life and Correspondence of ——, by William Roberts, 4 vols., 1834.
Porteus (Right Reverend Beilby ——, Bishop of London). The Life of the ——, by the Rev. Robert Hodgson. 1811.
Sherwood (Mrs.). The Life of ——, edited and abridged by Isabella Gilchrist. 1917.
—— The Life and Times of —— (1775–1851), from the Diaries of Captain and Mrs. Sherwood, ed. F. J. Harvey Darton. 1910.
Shore (John, Lord Teignmouth). Memoirs of the Life and Correspondence of——, by his son. 2 vols., 1843.
Simeon (Rev. Charles). Memoirs of the Life of the ——, with a selection from his writings and correspondence, by the Rev. William Carus. 1847.
Wilberforce (William). The Life of ——, by his sons, R. I. and S. Wilberforce, 5 vols., 1st ed. 1838.

D. NONCONFORMITY.

1. The Old Denominations (Presbyterians, Independents, Baptists).

(i) *General.*

Bogue (David) and Bennett (James). History of Dissenters, from the Revolution in 1688 to the year 1808, 4 vols., 1808–12, with
Bennett (James). The History of Dissenters (from 1808–38), 1839,
Remains the standard authority.
Skeats (H. S.). A History of the Free Churches of England, from A.D. 1688 to A.D. 1851, 1868; new ed., revised and continued to 1891, by C. S. Miall, 1891.
Adds hardly anything to Bogue and Bennett. *See also:*
Evans (John). A Sketch of the Denominations into which the Christian World is Divided; accompanied with a persuasive to religious moderation, 1st ed., 1795; 9th ed., 1807.

(ii) *Works relating*

(*a*) To a particular sect.

Waddington (John). Congregational History.
An enormous compilation; the entire work extends from 1200–1880. See the following vols.:
Waddington (John). Congregational History, 1700–1800; in relation to contemporaneous events, education, the eclipse of faith, revivals and Christian missions. 1876.
—— Congregational History, continuation to 1850; with special reference to the rise, growth and influence of institutions, representative men, and the inner life of the Churches. 1878.
Ivimey (Joseph). A History of the English Baptists, vol. iii; comprising the principal events of the history of Protestant

Dissenters, from the Revolution in 1688 till 1760, and of the London Baptist churches during that period, 1824. Vol. iv, comprising the principal events of the history of the Protestant Dissenters during the reign of George III, and of the Baptist churches in London, with notices of many of the principal churches in the country during the same period. 1830.

Lindsey (Rev. Theophilus). Memoirs of the Late ——, M.A.; including a brief analysis of his works, together with anecdotes and letters of eminent persons, his friends and correspondents. Also, a General View of the Progress of the Unitarian Doctrine in England and America, by Thomas Belsham. 1812.

(*b*) To a particular sect, or to all the Dissenting bodies, in a particular locality. *See especially:*

Coleman (Thomas). Memorials of the Independent Churches in Northamptonshire. 1853.

Sibree (John) and Caston (M.). Independency in Warwickshire, . . . 1855.

Miall (James G.). Congregationalism in Yorkshire, . . . 1868.

Halley (Rev. Robert). Lancashire: its Puritanism and Nonconformity, 2 vols., 1869.

Urwick (William). Historical Sketches of Nonconformity in the County Palatine of Chester, . . . 1864.

—— Nonconformity in Hertfordshire, . . . 1884.

—— Nonconformity in Worcester, . . . 1897.

Densham (W.) and Ogle (J.). The Story of the Congregational Churches of Dorset, . . . 1899.

Congregational Historical Society Transactions, from 1904.

(iii) *Works which we have found useful in our study of the older sects.*

(*a*) Biographies.

Hall (Robert). A Brief Memoir of the Life of ——, by Olinthus Gregory, 1833.

Hinton (Rev. James). A Biographical Portraiture of the Late ——, Pastor of a Congregational Church in Oxford, by his son, J. Howard Hinton. . . . 1824.

(*b*) Works of controversy.

Pierce (James). The Western Inquisition; or, a relation of the controversy which has been lately among Dissenters in the West of England. 1720.

An Inquiry into the Causes of the Decay of the Dissenting Interest; in a letter to a Dissenting minister. 2nd ed., 1730.

Doddridge (Philip). Free Thoughts on the most Probable Means of Reviving the Dissenting Interest, occasioned by the late inquiry into the cause of its decay; addressed to the author of that inquiry (Works, 1802, vol. iv. pp. 199 sqq.).

Plain Reasons: I, For Dissenting from the Communion of the Church of England; II, Why Dissenters are not, nor can be guilty of schism, in peaceably separating from the places of public worship in the Church of England; and III, Several

common objections brought by Churchmen against Dissenters, Answered by a true Protestant, 23rd ed., to which is added, a Letter to a Divine in Germany, giving a brief but true account of the Protestant Dissenters in England. By the late Rev. Edmund Calamy, . . . 1736.

The Causes and Reasons of the Present Declension among the Congregational Churches, in London and the Country, in a letter addressed to the pastors, deacons and members of those Churches, by one of that denomination, interspersed with reflections on Methodism and Sandemanianism, 1766.

Brine (John). A Refutation of Arminian Principles; delivered in a pamphlet, entitled The Modern Question, concerning repentance and faith, examined with candour, . . . in a letter to a friend, 1743.

Fuller (Andrew). The Gospel Worthy of all Acceptation; or, the duty of sinners to believe in Jesus Christ, 1785, 2nd ed., with corrections and additions, to which is added an appendix, on the question whether the existence of any holy disposition of heart be necessary in order to believe in Christ, 1801.

Robinson (R.). A Plan of Lectures on the Principles of Nonconformity, for the Instruction of Catechumens, 1778; 6th ed., 1797.

Kingsbury (William). An Apology for Village Preachers; or, an account of the proceedings and motives of Protestant Dissenters and serious Christians of other denominations, in their attempts to suppress infidelity and vice, and to spread vital religion in country places—especially where the means of pious instruction among the poor are rare; with some animadversions on an "Anonymous Appeal to the People," and replies to objections, 1798.

Hall (Robert). Modern Infidelity Considered with Respect to its Influence on Society, . . . 1800.

Bright (J. S.). Apostolical Independency; exemplified in the history, doctrines, discipline, and ordinances of the Congregational Churches, commonly called Independent. 1842.

Porter (S. T.). Lectures on the Ecclesiastical System of the Independents, 1856.

Hinton (John Howard). A Review of the Congregational System, in connection with a department of its local history, being the first circular letter of the Berks and West London Association [1826 ?].

(iv) *Nonconformist Periodicals.*

The Protestant Dissenter's Magazine, 6 vols., 1794–9.
Organ of the older Nonconformity.

The Evangelical Magazine, from 1793.
Organ of the new Evangelical Nonconformity.
Less exclusively theological

The Eclectic Review, from 1805.

The British Review and London Critical Journal, from 1811.

2. Methodism.

(i) *General.*

Stevens (Abel). History of the Religious Movement of the Eighteenth Century called Methodism; considered in its different denominational forms and in its general relation to Protestantism, revised and corrected by Rev. William Willey, 3 vols., 1863–5.

(ii) *Wesleyan Methodism.*

Wesley (John). Works, 4th ed., 14 vols., 1840–2.

Southey (Robert). The Life of Wesley, and the Rise and Progress of Methodism, 2 vols., 1st ed., 1820.

A popular work, but of high quality and still very well worth reading.

Tyerman (Rev. L.). The Life and Times of the Rev. John Wesley, 3 vols., 1870–1.

Léger (Augustin). L'Angleterre Religieuse et les Origines du Méthodisme au XVIII^e Siècle. La Jeunesse de Wesley. 1910.

Lelièvre (Mathieu). John Wesley, Sa Vie et son Œuvre, 3rd ed., 1891.

Smith (George). History of Wesleyan Methodism, 2nd ed., corrected, vol. i, Wesley and his Times, 1859; vol. ii, The Middle Age (to 1805), 1862; vol. iii, Modern Methodism, 1862.

Crowther (Jonathan). A Portraiture of Methodism; or, the history of the Wesleyan Methodists, showing their rise, progress and present state, . . . 1815.

Jackson (Thomas). The Centenary of Wesleyan Methodism; a brief sketch of the rise, progress and present state of the Wesleyan Methodist Societies throughout the World. 1839.

Turner (George). The Constitution and Discipline of Wesleyan Methodism, in which various misrepresentations of its leading principles are exposed, and its present form is vindicated. 1850.

Minutes of the Methodist Conferences, from the first held in London by the late Rev. John Wesley, M.A., in the year 1744, vol. i., 1812.

Arminian Magazine; consisting of extracts and original translations on Universal Redemption, 20 vols., 1778–97. Continued under the title: The Methodist Magazine.

Wesley Historical Society, proceedings and publications, from 1896–7.

Osborn (G.). Outlines of Wesleyan Bibliography; or, a record of Methodist literature from the beginning, 1869.

(iii) *Other Methodist bodies.*

Tyerman (Rev. L.). The Life of the Rev. George Whitefield, . . . 1876–7.

General Rules of the Government of the New Connexion of Methodists, 1803.

[Blackwell (John)]. Life of the Rev. Alexander Kilham, formerly a preacher under the Rev. J. Wesley and one of the founders

of the Methodist New Connexion in the year 1797, including a full account of the disputes which occasioned the separation. 1838.
Ryder (Rev. Thomas). The Spiritual Life and Aims of the Methodist New Connexion, 1897.
Crothers (Rev. T. D.), T. Rider, W. Longbottom, W. J. Townshend, G. Packer. The Centenary of the Methodist New Connexion, 1897.
Petty (John). The History of the Primitive Methodist Connexion, from its origin to the Conference of 1860, . . . new ed., 1864.

(iv) *Anti-Methodist Literature.*

Strictures on Methodism, by a careful observer.
Ingram (R.A., B.D.). The causes of the increase of Methodism and Dissension, and of the popularity of what is called Evangelical Preaching, and the means of obviating them, considered in a sermon, . . . 1807.
[Leigh Hunt]. An Attempt to show the Folly and Danger of Methodism, by the editor of the Examiner, 1809.
Methodism Displayed and Christianism Detected; intended as an antidote against, and a preservative from, the delusive principles and unscriptural doctrines of a modern set of seducing preachers, and as a defence of the Regular and Orthodox Clergy from their unjust reflections. By a member of the Church of England, 1813.
Ward (Valentine). Free and Candid Strictures on Methodism, and especially its finances, . . . 1818.

E. PHILANTHROPY: THE REFORM OF PUBLIC MORALITY

The Reports of the Society for Bettering the Condition and Increasing the Comforts of the Poor, 5 vols. (1798–1808).
A fine record of philanthropic achievement. From this compilation Holyoake (G. J.) drew the material for his popular work—
Self-Help a Hundred Years Ago, 1888.
Dobbs (A. E.). Education and Social Movements (1700–1850), 1919.
The Philanthropist, or repository for hints and suggestions calculated to promote the comfort and happiness of man [ed. by W. Allen], 7 vols., 1811–19; also Allen's Biography:
Allen (William). Life of ——, with selections from his correspondence, 3 vols., 1846–7.
Highmore (A.). Pietas Londiniensis; the history, design and present state of the various public charities in and near London. 1810.
—— Philanthropia Metropolitana: a view of the charitable institutions established in and near London, chiefly during the last twelve years. 1822.

Lettsom (John Coakley). Hints Designed to Promote Beneficence, Temperance and Medical Science, 3 vols., 1st ed., 1801; new and enlarged ed., 1816.

On the abolition of the slave trade:

Clarkson (Thomas). A History of the Abolition of the Slave Trade, 2 vols., 1839.

—— A Biographical Sketch of ——, with occasional brief strictures on the misrepresentations of him contained in the Life of William Wilberforce, . . . by Thomas Taylor, 1839.

A curious picture of the manners of the period, the brutal sports, the gaming-houses and races will be found in the works of Pierce Egan, and especially in:

Pierce Egan. Life in London; or, the day and night scenes of Jeremy Hawthorn, Esq., and his elegant friend Corinthian Tom, accompanied by Bob Logic, the Oxonian, in their rambles and sprees through the Metropolis, 1st ed., 1821.

F. SCOTTISH PRESBYTERIANISM

Sack (D. Karl Heinrich). Die Kirche von Schottland, Beiträge zu deren Geschichte und Beschreibung, 2 vols., 1844–5.

Grub (George). An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland, from the introduction of Christianity to the present time. See for the period 1721–1857, vol. iv, 1861.

MacKerrow (Rev. John). History of the Secession Church, revised and enlarged, 1841.

Struthers (Gavin). The History of the Rise, Progress and Principles of the Relief Church, embracing notices of the other religious denominations in Scotland, 1843.

G. THE CATHOLICS

1. Contemporary Literature

[Berington (Rev. Jos.)]. The State and Behaviour of English Catholics, from the Reformation to the Year 1780, with a view to their present number, wealth, character, etc. In two parts, 1780.

—— The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Catholic Religion in England, during a period of two hundred and forty years, from the reign of Elizabeth to the present time, including the Memoirs of Gregorio Panzani, . . . 1813.

Butler (Charles). Historical Memoirs of the English, Irish and Scotch Catholics, from the Reformation to the present time. 2 vols., 1819.

Berington and Butler were Cisalpines.

Milner (John). Supplementary Memoirs of English Catholics, addressed to Charles Butler Esq., 1820.

Ultramontane.

2. General Works

Flanagan (Canon). History of the Church in England, from the earliest period to the establishment of the Hierarchy in 1850. 2 vols., 1857.

Amherst (W. J.). The History of Catholic Emancipation and the Progress of the Catholic Church in the British Isles (chiefly in England), from 1771 to 1820. 2 vols., 1886.

Ultramontane. Without value for the historian.

Ward (Bernard). The Dawn of the Catholic Revival in England, 1781–1803. 2 vols., 1909.

—— The Eve of Catholic Emancipation; being the history of the English Catholics during the first thirty years of the 19th century. Vols. i and ii, 1912.

Excellent works, based on the records.

3. Biography

Husenbeth (F. C.). The Life of the Right Rev. John Milner, 1862.

See also, as concerned with the question of Catholic emancipation in Ireland,

O'Connell (Daniel). The Life and Speeches of ——, ed. by his son, John O'Connell. 2 vols., 1846.

Grattan (Henry). Memoirs of the Life and Times of the Right Hon. ——, by his son, Henry Grattan, 5 vols., 1839–46.

H. THE JEWS

Goldsmid (F. H.). Remarks on the Civil Disabilities of British Jews. 1830.

Blunt (J. E.). A History of the Establishment and Residence of the Jews in England, with an inquiry into their civil disabilities. 1830.

Margoliouth (Rev. Moses). The History of the Jews in Great Britain. 3 vols., 1851.

Picciotto (James). Sketches of Anglo-Jewish History. 1875.

Schaible (K. H.). Die Juden in England vom achten Jahrhundert bis zum Gegenwart. Ein kulturgeschichtliches Bild. 1890.

II. FINE ARTS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE

A. FINE ARTS

1. General

Strange (Sir Robert). An Inquiry into the Rise and Establishment of the Royal Academy. 1775.

Barry (James). An Inquiry into the Real and Imaginary Obstructions to the Acquisition of the Arts in England. 1775.

—— A Letter to the Right Honourable the President, Vice-Presidents, and the rest of the Noblemen and Gentlemen of the Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce, . . . 1793.

—— A Letter to the Dilettanti Society, respecting the obtention of certain matters essentially necessary for the improvement of public taste, and for accomplishing the original views of the Royal Academy of Great Britain, 1798.

—— The Works of ——, 2 vols., 1809.

Dallaway (Rev. James). Anecdotes of the Arts in England; or, comparative observations on architecture, sculpture and painting, . . . 1880.

Hoare (Prince). Epochs of the Arts, 1813.

Taylor (N. S.). The Origin, Progress and Present Condition of the Fine Arts in Great Britain and Ireland, 2 vols. (the 2nd vol.), 1841.

Pye (John). Patronage of British Art; an historical sketch, comprising an account of the rise and progress of art and artists in London, from the beginning of the reign of George II, 1845.

Sandby (William). The History of the Royal Academy of Arts, from its Foundation in 1768 to the Present Time, with biographical notices of all its members, 2 vols., 1862.

2. PAINTING

[Carey (William)]. The National Obstacle to the National Public Style Considered; observations on the probable decline or extinction of British historical painting, from the effects of Church exclusion of paintings, 1825.

Barry, Opie and Fuseli. Lectures on Painting, by the Royal Academicians ——, ed. . . . by Ralph N. Wornum, 1848.

Wornum (Ralph Nicholson). The Epochs of Painting; a biographical and critical essay on painting and painters of all times and many places, 1864.

Chapter xxxii is a collection of biographical notices of all the English painters since the Renaissance.

West (Benjamin). The Life and Studies of ——, President of the Royal Academy of London, . . . compiled from material furnished from himself, by John Galt, 2 vols., 1816, 1820.

Haydon (Robert). Life of ——, Historical Painter, from his autobiography and journals. Ed. and compiled by Tom Taylor, 3 vols., 1853.

3. ARCHITECTURE

(i) *General*

Fergusson (James). History of the Modern Styles of Architecture, 3rd ed., revised; 2nd impression by Robert Kerr, 2 vols., 1902.

(ii) *The Classical Style.*

Stuart (James) and Revet (Nicholas). The Antiquities of Athens Measured and Delineated, vol. i, 1762; other volumes by different hands, 1787, 1794, 1816.

[Wood (R.) and Dawkin]. Les Ruines de Palmyre, autrement dite Tedmor, au Désert. A Londres chez A Millar dans le Strand, 1753.

R. Adam. Ruins of the Palace of the Emperor Diocletian at Spalatro in Dalmatia, 1763.

[Robert and James Adam]. The Works in Architecture of ——, vol. i containing the five following numbers, viz.: 1. the Seat of the Duke of Northumberland, at Sion; 2. the Villa of the Earl of Mansfield, at Kenwood; 3. the Seat of the Earl of Bute, at Luton Park; 4. the Public Buildings; 5. the Designs for the King and Queen, and the Princess Dowager of Wales, 1778.

(iii) *The Gothic Revival.*

Milner (Rev. John). The History, Civil and Ecclesiastical, and Survey of the Antiquities of Winchester, 2 vols. [1798].

—— A Dissertation on the Modern Style of altering Ancient Cathedrals, as exemplified in the Cathedral of Salisbury, 1798.

Warton (Rev. T.). Rev. J. Bentham, Captain Grose and the Rev. J. Milner, . . . Essays on Gothic Architecture, . . . 1800.

Milner (Rev. John). A Treatise on the Ecclesiastical Architecture of England during the Middle Ages, 1811.

Britton (John). The Architectural Antiquities of Great Britain; represented and illustrated in a series of views, elevations, plans, sections, and details, of various ancient English edifices, with historical and descriptive accounts of each, 5 vols. 1807–27.

Hall (Sir James). Essay on the Origin, History and Principles of Gothic Architecture, 1813.

Eastlake (Charles L.). A History of the Gothic Revival; an attempt to show how the taste for mediæval architecture which lingered in England during the last two centuries has since been encouraged and developed, 1872.

4. Music

Burney (Charles). A General History of Music, from the earliest ages to the present period, 4 vols., 1776–89 (see the concluding chapter).

Forsyth (Cecil). Music and Nationalism; a Study of English opera, 1912.

B. LITERATURE

1. General Works

The Cambridge History of Modern Literature, ed. by A. W. Ward and A. R. Waller. 14 vols., 1907–16.
Vol. xi, The Period of the French Revolution. Vol. xii, The Nineteenth Century.

Taine. Histoire de la Littérature Anglaise, 4 vols., 1st ed., 1863–4. English translation, 1st ed., 1871.

Oliphant (Mrs.). The Literary History of England in the end of the Eighteenth and beginning of the Nineteenth Century, 3 vols., 1882.

Gosse (Edmund). A Short History of Modern English Literature, 1898.

Also the two following works:

Craik (George L.). A Compendious History of English Literature and of the English Language, from the Norman Conquest, with numerous specimens, 2 vols., 1864 (the second volume).

Chambers's Cyclopædia of English Literature, new ed. by David Patrick; a history, critical and biographical, of authors in the English tongue from the earliest times till the present day, with specimens of their writings, 3 vols., 1901 (vols. ii and iii).

The series is rather an anthology of specimen passages than a literary history.

2. Novelists and Poets

(i) *General Works*

C. R. [Clara Reeve]. The Progress of Romance, through times, countries and manners, . . . 1785.

Scott (Sir Walter). Lives of the Novelists, 1825.

Dunlop (John Colin). History of Prose Fiction, 1st ed., 1814; new ed., revised with notes.

A concise textbook of the history of the novel from its beginnings. Chapter xiv (p. 46) traces the history of the English novel.

Brandes (George). Die Literatur des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts in ihren Hauptströmungen dargestellt, iv. vol. Der Naturalismus in England, 1900.

Courthope (W. J.). A History of English Poetry; vol. vi. the Romantic Movement in English Poetry. Effects of the French Revolution, 1910.

(ii) *Biographies, Memoirs, Correspondence.*

Burns (Robert). ——, by Auguste Angellier, 2 vols., 1893.

Byron (Lord). Letters and Journals . . . ed. by R. E. Prothero, 6 vols., 1898–1900.

—— Correspondence. Ed. John Murray. 2 vols., 1922.

Coleridge. La Vie d'un Poète, by Joseph Aynard, 1907.

Crabbe. Un Poète Réaliste Anglais, 1754–1832, by René Huchon, 1906. (English translation, 1907.)

Hunt (Leigh). The Autobiography of ——; a new ed., revised by the author, with further revision and an introduction by his eldest son, 1860.

Jeffrey (Lord). Life of ——, with a selection from his correspondence, by Lord Cockburn, 2 vols., 1852.

Lamb (Charles). The Complete Correspondence and Works of ——, with an essay on his life and genius by Thomas Purnell, aided by the recollections of the author's adopted daughter, 4 vols., 1870.

—— The Life of——, by E. V. Lucas. 2 vols. 1st ed. 1905; 2nd ed. revised 1907.

Rogers (Samuel). —— and his Circle, by R. Ellis Roberts.

Scott (Sir Walter, Bart.). Memoirs of the Life of ——, by John

Gibson Lockhart. 1st ed., 7 vols., 1837–8. We have used the latest ed., in 10 vols., 1902–3.

Seward (Anna). Biography entitled: A Swan and her Friends, by E. V. Lucas.

Southey (Robert). The Life and Correspondence of ——, edited by his son, C. C. Southey, 6 vols., 1849–50.

Wordsworth. La Jeunesse de ——, by Emile Legouis, 1896. (English translation, 1897.)

(iii) *Publishers and Booksellers.*

Constable (Archibald). —— and his Literary Correspondents; a memorial by his son, Thomas Constable, 3 vols., 1873.

Murray (John). A Publisher and his Friends; memoir and correspondence of the late ——, with an account of the origin and progress of the house, 1768–1843. 1891.

Rees (Thomas). Reminiscences of Literary London, from 1779 to 1853, . . . with extensive additions by John Britton; edited by a book-lover, 1896 (1st ed. printed for private circulation, 1853).

Knight (Charles). Shadows of the Old Booksellers, 1865; new ed. [1908].

3. Drama

(i) *Official Documents.*

Report from the Select Committee on Dramatic Literature, with the Minutes of Evidence, 1832.

Many years later than our period. Nevertheless, it contains useful material.

(ii) *General.*

Lawrence (James). Dramatic Emancipation, or, strictures on the state of the theatres, and the consequent degeneration of the drama; on the partiality and injustice of the London managers; on many theatrical regulations; and on the regulations on the Continent for the security of literary and dramatic property, particularly deserving the attention of the subscribers for a third theatre, 1813.

Reprinted in the Pamphleteer, vol. ii. pp. 369 sqq.

Dibdin (Charles, Jr.). History and Illustrations of the London Theatres; comprising an account of the origin and progress of the drama in England, with historical and descriptive accounts of the Theatre Royal, Covent Garden, Drury Lane, Haymarket, English Opera House, and Royal Amphitheatre, 1826.

[Genest]. Some Account of the English Stage, from the Restoration in 1660 to 1830, 10 vols., 1832.

Vols. vii. (1790–1805) and viii. (1805–19).

Doran (Dr.). "Their Majesties' Servants." Annals of the English Stage from Thomas Betterton to Edmund Kean (published and corrected by Rob. W. Law), 3 vols., 1888.

Vol. iii extends from the death of Foote to the death of Kean

Nicholson (Watson). The Struggle for a Free Stage in London 1906.
Contains a bibliography.

(iii) *Collections of Plays.*

Inchbald (Mrs.). The British Theatre; or, a collection of plays . . . acted at the Theatres Royal, . . . 25 vols., 1808.
—— A Collection of Farces and other After Pieces, . . . 7 vols., 1815.
Dibdin (T. S.). The London Theatre; a collection of the most celebrated dramatic pieces, . . . 26 vols., 1815–18.

(iv) *Biographies.*

Colman. Memoirs of the —— Family, . . . 2 vols., 1841.
Dibdin (Thomas). The Reminiscences of ——, 2 vols., 1827.
Inchbald (Mrs.). Memoirs of ——, . . . by James Boaden, 2 vols., 1833.
Jordan (Mrs.). The Life of ——, . . . by James Boaden, 2 vols., 1831.
Reynolds (Frederick). The Life and Times of ——, written by himself, 2 vols., 1827.
Kemble (John Phillip). Memoirs of ——, . . . by James Boaden.
Siddons (Mrs.). Memoirs of ——, . . . by James Boaden, 2 vols., 1827.

C. SCIENCE, EDUCATION

1. Educational Institutions

(i) *Elementary Education.*

A Digest of Parochial Returns made to the Select Committee appointed to inquire into the Education of the Poor; Session 1818, 3 vols., 1819.
Of the Education of the Poor; being the first part of a Digest of the Reports of the Society for Bettering the Condition of the Poor, and containing a selection of those articles which have reference to education, 1809.
Chalmers (Thomas). Considerations on the System of Parochial Schools in Scotland, and on the advantage of establishing them in large towns, 1819.

(ii) *Secondary Education.*

Ackermann (Rudolph). The History of the Colleges of Winchester, Eton and Westminster, with the Charterhouse, the Schools of St. Paul's, Merchant Taylors', Harrow and Rugby, and the free school of Christ's Hospital, 1816.
Rugby. Recollections of——, by an old Rugbeian, 1848.
Eton. A History of —— College, by H. C. Maxwell Lyte, 1st ed., 1875; 4th ed., 1911.
Harrow. —— School and its Surroundings, by Percy M. Thornton, 1885.
Arnold (Thomas). The Life and Correspondence of ——, by Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, 1st ed., 2 vols., 1844.

(iii) *The Universities.*

(*a*) The English Universities.

Huber (V. A.). The English Universities, . . . translated from the German and abridged by Francis W. Newman, 2 vols., 1843.

The text is accompanied by critical notes, often of importance.

Mansbridge (Albert). The Older Universities of England: Oxford and Cambridge, 1923.

Oxford University Statutes, translated by G. R. M. Ward, vol. ii containing the University Statutes from 1767 to 1850. 1851.

Oxford University Calendar, from 1810.

[Copleston (Edward)]. A Reply to the Calumnies of the Edinburgh Review, against Oxford, containing an account of studies pursued in that University, 2nd ed., 1810.

—— Memoir of ——, with selections from his diary and correspondence, by William James Copleston, 1851.

Cox (G. V.). Recollections of ——, 1868.

Statuta Universitatis Cantabrigiensis, 1785.

Statutes of the University of Cambridge, with some Acts of Parliament relating to the University. 1882.

Cambridge University Calendar, from 1796.

Jebb (Rev. John). Remarks upon the Present Mode of Education in the University of Cambridge; to which is added a proposal for its improvement. 1773.

Dyer (G.). History of the University and Colleges of Cambridge; including notices of the founders and eminent men, 2 vols., 1814.

Cooper (C. H.). Annals of Cambridge, 4 vols., 1852 (vol. iv., 1688–1849).

Gunning (Henry). Reminiscences of the University, Town and County of Cambridge, 2 vols., 1854.

Winstanley (D. A.). The University of Cambridge in the Eighteenth Century. 1923.

(*b*) The Scottish Universities.

Report made to His Majesty by a Royal Commission into the State of the Universities of Scotland, 1831.

For the study of the Scottish intelligentsia in the 18th and 19th centuries, the following biographies are of value:

Hutcheson (Francis). His Life, Teaching and Position in the History of Philosophy, by W. R. Scott. 1900.

Smith (Adam). Life of ——, by John Rae. 1895.

Mill (James). A Biography by A. Bain. 1882.

Carlyle (Thomas). A History of the First Forty Years of his Life, by A. Froude, 2 vols., 1882.

And especially the two works by:

Cockburn (A.). Memorials of his Time, 1856.

—— Life of Lord Jeffrey, with a selection from his correspondence, 2 vols., 1852.

(iv) *Medicine.*

Statuta Collegii sive Communitatis Medicorum Londiniensis, 1745.

Bye-Laws, Ordinances, Rules and Constitutions, Made and Ordained by the Master, Governors and Court of Assistants, of the Royal College of Surgeons, in London, 1802. 1806.

A Letter from a Physician in Town to his Friend in the Country, concerning the disputes at present subsisting between the Fellows and Licentiates of the College of Physicians in London, 1753.

Gregory (John). Lectures on the Duties and Qualifications of a Physician, 1770; other eds., 1772, 1805.

Percival (Thomas). Medical Ethics; or, a code of institutes and precepts, adapted to the professional conduct of physicians and surgeons: 1. In hospital practice; 2. In private, or general practice; 3. In relation to apothecaries; 4. In cases which may require a knowledge of law; to which is added an appendix, containing a discourse on hospital duties, also notes and illustrations, 1803.

—— The Works, Literary, Moral and Medical of ——, . . . to which are prefixed memoirs of his life and writings, and a selection from his literary correspondence; new ed., 4 vols., 1807.

Simon (Sir John). English Sanitary Institutions, reviewed in their course of development, and in some of their political and social relations, 1890.

Chapter v is a compendium of the history of the medical corporations.

Munk (William). The Roll of the Royal College of Physicians of London; comprising biographical sketches of all the eminent physicians, from 1518 to 1828, 2nd ed., revised and enlarged, 3 vols., 1828.

Abernethy (John). Memoirs of ——, by George MacIlwain, 3rd ed., 1856.

Christison (Sir Robert). The Life of ——, edited by his sons; vol. i, Autobiography, 1885.

Clarke (J. F.). Autobiographical Recollections of the Medical Profession, 1874.

Cooper (Sir Astley). The Life of ——, Bart., by B. B. Cooper, 2 vols., 1843.

Knighton (Sir William). Memoirs of ——, Bart., by Lady Knighton, 1838.

(v) *Learned Societies.*

(*a*) The Royal Society.

The standard authority is:

Weld (C. R.). A History of the Royal Society, with Memoirs of the Presidents, . . . 2 vols., 1849.

See further:

Kippis (Andrew). Observations on the Late Contests in the Royal Society, 1784.

Barrow (Sir John). Sketches of the Royal Society, and Royal Society Club, 1849.

Huggins (Sir William). The Royal Society, or Science in the State and in the Schools, . . . 1906.
Merely a collection of academic orations.
Maiden (J. H.). Sir Joseph Banks, the "Father of Australia," 1909.

(*b*) Other Societies.

Jones (Dr. Bence). The Royal Institution: its Founder and its First Professors, . . . 1871.
Woodward (H. B.). The History of the Geological Society of London. 1907.

2. The Progress of Science

(i) *The Natural Sciences.*

(*a*) General.

Thomson (Thomas). History of the Royal Society from its Institution to the end of the Eighteenth Century, 1812.
This is not so much a history of the Royal Society, as a sketch of scientific progress, based on a methodical use of the Philosophical Transactions.
—— The History of Chemistry, 2 vols., 1830–1.
An excellent history of the Atomic Theory.
Whewell (William). History of the Inductive Sciences, from the earliest to the present time, 1st ed., 1837; 3rd ed., enlarged, 1857.
Leslie (Sir John). Dissertation exhibiting a general view of the progress of Mathematical and Physical Science (Encyclopædia Brittannica, vol. i, 1842).
Ostwald (W.). L'Evolution d'une Science, la Chimie, translated from the German by Marcel Dufour, Paris, 6th ed., 1910.

(*b*) Biographies.

Beddoes (Thomas). Memoirs of the Life of ——, by John Edmonds Stock, 1811.
Dalton (John). Memoirs of the Life and Scientific Researches of ——, by W. C. Henry, 1854.
—— Religio Chemici, Essays, by George Wilson, 1862.
Contains an essay on Dalton and an essay on Wollaston.
Davy (Sir Humphry). Life of ——, Bart., by J. A. Paris, 2 vols., 1831.
—— Memoirs of ——, Bart., by John Davy, 2 vols., 1836.
—— Fragmentary Remains, Literary and Scientific, of ——, with a sketch of his life and selections from his correspondence, edited by his brother John Davy, 1858.
—— Grosse Männer, by W. Ostwald, 2nd ed., 1910.
Contains a chapter on Davy.
Faraday. The Life and Letters of ——, by H. Bence Jones, 2 vols., 1870.
Herschell (Sir William). Analyse Historique et Critique de la Vie et des Travaux de ——, by D. F. J. Arago, 1843.

——. His Life and Works, by Edward S. Holden, 1881.
Rumford (Baron). See the work of Bence Jones mentioned above, History of the Royal Institution, etc.
Young (Thomas). Life of ——, by George Peacock, 1855.

(ii) *The Moral Sciences.*

(*a*) General.

Stephen (Leslie). The English Utilitarians, 3 vols., 1900, vol. i. Jeremy Bentham; vol. ii. James Mill.
Halévy (Elie). La Formation du Radicalisme Philosophique, 3 vols., 1901–4.
Cannan (Edwin). A History of the Theories of Production and Distribution in English Political Economy, from 1776 to 1848. 1893.

(*b*) Biographies.

Malthus. —— and His Work, by James Bonar, 1885.
Mill (James). ——, a Biography, by Alexander Bain, 1822.
Mill (John Stuart). Autobiography, 1873.
Ricardo (David). ——, a Centenary Estimate, by J. H. Hollander, 1910.

From this bibliography we have omitted the original scientific works which appeared during our period. We have omitted also contemporary novels and poems. It may be added that all the important works on economics which appeared during our period will be found under the appropriate headings in the bibliography of Book II (Economic Life).

INDEX

African slave trade, 79, 80
Agriculture, agrarian rioting, 108; machinery, scientists and, 194; State protection, 218
Agriculture, Board of, 194
Allen, William, Quaker philanthropist, 78, 192, 193, 194, 207
America, slave trade, 79; war with, 49
Animals, cruelty to, 76
Architecture, 117–120
Arianism, 27, 40
Aristocracy, British, 163
Arminianism, 27, 28, note 29, 30, 38, 59
Army, Catholics in, 98; corporal punishment, 79; duelling in, 76; freedom of worship in, 52; military parsons, 17; militia system, 50–55; and Nonconformity, 50
Artists, 119, 123; patronage of, 111, 116
Arts, no State protection for, 218
Askesian Society, 193
Astronomy in Great Britain, 183
Austen, Jane, novelist, 141–143, 164 (note)

Banks, Sir Joseph, President of the Royal Society, 184, 186, 195, 197
Bank of England, 118
Baptist Union, 44
Baptists, 24, 25, 27, 29, 30, 33, 39, 49, 61; Central society, 44; local associations, 43, 44–46, 48; missionary work, 69, 71, 72; and slave trade, 81
Bedford, Duke of, landowner, 157
Bentham, Jeremy, 39, 78, 157–158, 172, 192, 200, 204–215
Bentinck, William Cavendish, *see* Portland, Duke of
Bible Christians, 39
Bible societies, 69–73, 176
Birmingham, Philosophical Society, 69–71; Sunday schools, 155
British Colonies, Church in, 72 (note); missionary work in, 70; and slave trade, 80, 82
British and Foreign Bible Society, 70
British and Foreign School Society, 157
British Museum, 185
Bull-baiting, 77
Burke, Edmund, 212
Burney, Miss Fanny, novelist, 140–1, 142
Byron, George Gordon, Lord, at Harrow, 164; poetry of, 144–146; and publishers, 132, 133, 135–6, 145 (note); travels, 144–7

Calvinism, 24, 28, 30, 38, 45, 85, 88, 215
Cambridge Bible Society, 70
Cambridge University, 171–8, 184; and candidates for Ordination, 13, 15; Evangelical movement in, 55; and Utilitarianism, 212
Canada, State appointment of Catholic bishops, 105
Canning, George, 48, 106, 109, 125, 132
Capitalism, among cotton manufacturers, effects, 217
Castlereagh, Robert Stewart, Viscount, 80–1, 82, 103, 104
Catholic Association in Ireland, 108
Catholics of Ireland and Great Britain, 91, 98, 103–9; authority of Pope, 101–102; Emancipation, 52, 54, 97–109; eminent, in the United Kingdom, 98 (note); and Gothic architecture revival, 116; Irish clergy, 92–4; Relief Acts, 97, 99; religious orders, 32 (note); seminaries transported to England, 102
Chemistry, Dalton's discoveries, 189–191
Children, employment of, 73, 79, 152, 154, 160
Chimney-sweeps, attempted legislation to protect children, 78
Church of England, 12–24; *see also* High *and* Low Church parties; abuses in, 22–23, 63–69; accommodation, 20–22; articles of belief, 12, 14; attitude to rival sects, 55, 218; candidates for Ordination and the Universities, 178; clergy, characteristics, living conditions, stipends, etc., 12–24, 66, 67; episcopacy, *see that title*; Evangelical movement, 55–63; and music, 116; organization, 12; plural benefices, 20–1, 65–6; revenue, 18; sale of benefices, 16–17; tithe system, 23
Church Missionary Society, 69
Civil Administration, weakness due to confusion of branches, 215–7
Clapham Sect of evangelical clergy, 58–9
Clergy, *see under* Church of England.
Coleridge, Samuel Taylor, 62, 124, 143, 148, 158, 194, 213
Colonies, *see* British Colonies.
Congregationalists, local associations, 43, 44–5
Constable, Archibald, publisher, 125, 131–7, 187

Crown, attachment of House of Lords to, as Head of the Church, 12
Cruelty to animals, 77

Dale, David, philanthropic work among mill workers, 153
Dalton, John, chemist, 9, 189, 195, 199, 208
Danish Mission in India, 71
Davy, Sir Humphry, 9, 192, 193–200
Davy's Safety Lamp, 199
Democrats, 51
Dissenters, 24–32, 51–5; itinerant preachers, attempted Legislation against, 54; local associations, 43, 48; Ministers, living conditions, etc., 30–1, 44; numbers, 50; preachers, 42; and republicanism, 48–50; revolutionary spirit, decline in, 48; and slave trade, 81; social class of members, 41–2; trustees and congregation, legal position, 31
Drama, English, 126–131
Dublin, University, 171 (note), 184
Duels, suppression of, 76
Dundas, Henry, *see* Melville, Lord.

East India Company, 71–2, 184, 203
Economists, 200–5
Edgeworth, Maria, novelist, 142
Edinburgh, publishing houses, 131–6; Royal Society of, 184; University, 166, 168, 170, 181
Education, dames' schools, 153; effect of Protestantism and science on, 151; elementary, 152–161; English Universities, 171–8; schools of industry, 153; Scottish Universities, 165–170; secondary, 161–5; Sunday schools, 155–6; university debating societies, 170; university scholarships, 167–8, 171
Electro-chemistry, 196–9
Engraving, 123
Episcopacy, 15–6; and Church reforms, 63, 66, 68; and Evangelicals, 61–3; and Indian Missions, 72–3; Irish, and State control of clerical appointments, 104–6; patronage of schools of National Society, 158–9
Eton School, 162, 164
Evangelicals, 215; and Cambridge University, 171; influence in moral reforms, 73–9; missionary work, 69–70; and slave trade, 71
Exeter, Marquis of, 74–5

Foreign Missions, 69–73
Foundlings' Hospital, 182
Fox, Charles James, 81–2
France, clergy, exiles in England, 102; Colonies and slave trade, 80, 81; influence in painting, 122; moral qualities contrasted with English, 74; Revolution, 73–5, 100; Roman Catholicism and Napoleon, 103
Free Thinkers, 73
Free Trade, 217

Geological Society, 185, 202
George III, 75–6, 98, 101–3, 112–4, 120–2, 218
George IV, as Prince Regent, 114, 121, 124, 125, 130
German drama, in England, 126–7
German influence on poetry, 143
Germany, missionary work, 69; political economists of, 209–210; Roman Catholics in, 101 (note); scholars and philosophy, 175, 213
Gloucestershire, Sunday schools, 155, 156
Gordon Riots, 99–100
Greenwich Observatory, 184–5
Grenville, William Wyndham, Lord, 49, 172
Guilds, disappearance of, 218

Harrow School, 162, 164
Harrowby, Lord, 50, 66–7, 72
Herschel, Sir William, 9, 184, 199
High Church party, 13; and Church reform, 65, 67–9; hostility to Lancastrian schools, 158; opposition to Catholics, 101; and Oxford University, 172; philosophic views, 215
Hogarth, Thomas, 113–4
House of Commons, and Clapham sect, 59
Howard, Charles, *see* Norfolk, Duke of.
Hume, David, 87, 133, 168–9, 176, 201, 212

Independents, 24, 25, 29, 30, 33, 38, 39, 49, 61
India, observatories, 184; Vellore Mutiny, 71–2
Individualism, 215
Industrial Revolution, 151
Ireland, Catholic Church in, 91–8; Catholic and Presbyterian revolt against tithe, 23; Catholic seminary, grant to, 102; Catholics, numbers of, 9; Established Church in, 16, 21; Landowners, *see that title*; Methodism in, 91; political and religious problems of, 104–9; Presbyterians, 104; Royal Irish Academy, 185

Jacobinism, 48, 49, 50, 175, 219; anti-Jacobinism, 49
Jamaica slaves, Dissenters and, 52
Jenkinson, Robert Banks, *see* Liverpool, Earl of.
Jews, 83–4
Jury system, 217
Justices of the peace, 217

Lancaster, Joseph, 156–8
Lancastrian schools, 157–8, 213
Landowners, clerical appointments, 16–7
Leeds, Sunday Schools, 155
Liberalism, 52, 87–9
Libraries, 188
Linnæn Society, 185
Literary Fund, 124–6
Literary and scientific societies, 188–93

Literature, encyclopædias, 187; men of letters, patronage, 124–6; novels, 137–43; popular scientific periodicals, etc., 187–8; publishers and authors, 131–2; no State protection, 218
Liverpool, Robert Banks Jenkinson, Earl of, 80
Liverpool, Irish Catholics in, 94; libraries in, 188
London architecture of, 117, 118, 121; education in, 192–3; hospitals, 182; Irish Catholics in, 94; publishing houses, 131–6; Stock Exchange, 84; theatres, 128, 130
London Institution, 193
London Missionary Society, 69
Longmans, publishers, 131, 134, 187
Low Church party, 14, 56; and Church reform, 66; philosophic views, 215

Malthus, Thomas Robert, theories of, 154, 200–5, 215
Manchester, literary and scientific societies in, 188, 189
Manufactures, art in, 111, 112; children in factories, 78; and decline in education, 152; development, 218; machinery, effect of, 218; and scientific discoveries, 198; State protection, 218
Medical profession, 178–83
Melville, Henry Dundas, Lord, First Lord of the Admiralty, 89 (note)
Methodism, *see also* Wesleyans; academies and seminaries, 26, 40; Bible Christians, 39; influence on Church of England, 55–63; influence of, new sects, 32–50; in Ireland, 91; missionary work, 69; and music, 116; new Methodist connexion, 38; Primitive Methodists, 39; revival, 9, 11–2, 23, 151; rise and influence of, 32–50; in Scotland, 84–5; and slave trade, 81
Militia system, *see under* Army.
Mill, James, philosopher, 39, 90, 157, 158, 200, 206–7, 209, 215
Milner, Isaac, evangelical divine, 57–8, 60, 71, 73, 175, 177
Murray, John, publisher, 132–5, 145 (note), 146
Music, lack of, in England, 116–7

National Society for Education of the Poor, 158–9
Navy, Catholics in, 98
Newcastle, Literary and Philosophical Society, 191
Norfolk, Charles Howard, Duke of, 95, 96

Observatories, 184–5
O'Connell, Daniel, policy of, 106–9
Oxford Bible Society, 70; University, 12–3, 171–8, 184, 212
Owen, Robert, philanthropist, 153, 154, 207, 213

Palmer's Royal Theatre, 128
Paris, Treaty of, 81
Peel, Sir Robert, 154, 207
Penal code reform, 78
Penal Laws, and Catholics, 95–7
Perceval, Spencer, Prime Minister, 54, 65 (note), 67, 72
Petty, Lord Henry, 170
Philosophy, in Scottish Universities, 168–9
Physicians and Surgeons, education of, 178–83
Pietism, Protestant, 214–5
Pitt, William, the younger, 76 (note), 79, 98, 104, 124–6, 154, 206, 212
Poetry, 143–50
Poor Law system, 205; Malthus on poor relief, 201; pauper children, education of, 153–4
Pope, authority of the, 101–3
Population, Malthus' principles, 200–4, 214
Portland, William Cavendish Bentinck, third Duke of, Prime Minister, 22
Portugal, and slave trade, 80
Presbyterians, 24, 25, 28, 30, 32, 39, 45, 49, 61; Irish, 104; Scottish, 84–91, 93, 167
Press, freedom of, 217
Price, Richard, philosopher, economist and preacher, 28, 48, 49, 131
Priestley, Joseph, Presbyterian Minister, 28, 41, 48, 49, 131, 191, 212
Primitive Methodists, 39
Prison reform, 78
Prisons, Bentham's model type, 206, 213
Public schools, 161–5; monopoly of scholarships at Oxford, 171
Publishing trade, 131–6
Puritans, and artists, 121; and drama, 128; and music, 116

Quakers, 61, 78, 81, 157

Religious condition, 218
Ricardo, David, theories of, 84, 200–5, 210
Riots, Gordon Riots against Catholics, 99–100; superseded by strike, 217
Romilly, Sir Samuel, law reformer, 78, 206
Royal Academy, 111 (note), 112–6, 120–4, 218
Royal College of Physicians, 178–81
Royal College of Surgeons, 180
Royal Institution, 193–200
Royal Society, 185–6, 198, 199, 218

St. Paul's Cathedral, proposed decoration, 121
"Saints," 59, 63–4, 66, 67, 71–2, 76, 77, 100
Science, attitude of Government to, 186, 218; Dalton's work and discoveries, 189–91; Davy's work and discoveries, 193–200; in English universities, 173, 175–8; scientific bodies, 178–87; in Scottish universities, 169–70
Scotland, Catholics in, 98, 102; elementary schools, 152–3; General Assembly of, 86, 167; Methodism in, 84–5;

Scotland, Catholics—*contd.*
Presbyterians, 84–91, 94, 167; progress of science in, 186; Royal College of Physicians and Scottish doctors, 178–9, 181; secondary education, 161–2; universities, 165–70, 212
Sculpture and Painting, 120–4
Sheridan, Richard Brinsley, 126
Simeon, Charles, evangelical divine, 57, 58, 59, 60, 69, 70, 71, 175
Slave trade, abolition, 79–82; Cambridge University and, 175
Smith, Sydney, 51, 116–7, 194
Societies of artists, 115–6
Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge, 70, 71, 153
Society for the Suppression of Vice, 75
Socinianism, 27, 28, 40
Spain, and slave trade, 79–81
Strikers, in place of riots, 217

Telford, Thomas, engineer, 160
Theatres, 130; licensing of, 127–8
Thomson, Thomas, chemist, 190–1, 209
Thornton, Henry, M.P., banker, 58, 69, 100, 156
Tierney, George, 76
Tithes, 23
Tories, and Catholic emancipation, 101; and Nonconformists, 52, 55, 100; and Oxford University, 171; and Utilitarianism, 211–2
Trafalgar Monument, 121
Trinitarianism, 28

Unitarianism, 28, 40, 55, 215
Utilitarian school of political economists, 205–15

Vienna, Congress of, 103

Wales, Church in, 38; Dissenters in, 41, 42, 70
Walpole, Horace, novelist, 137, 137–8
Watt, James, 27, 169
Wellington, Arthur Wellesly, Duke of, 82, 105, 162
Wesley, John, 11, 32–9, 49, 56, 84–5, 86, 91, 99, 116, 156, 215
Wesleyan Committee of Privileges, 52, 53
Wesleyans, *see also* Methodism; Circuit system, 34–5; importance of revival in social organization, 46–7; in Ireland, 91; numbers, 37, 40, 43; preachers' stipends, 35–6, 43–4; rise of, 32–9
Whigs, and Cambridge University, 175; Church policy, 13–4; and Nonconformists, 51
Whitbread, Samuel, 128, 154
Whitefield, George, 11, 38, 41, 56, 59, 85
Wilberforce, William, 58–9, 60, 61, 63, 66 (note), 69, 71, 72–3, 76, 78, 79, 82, 100, 109, 150, 154, 156, 157, 159
Windham, William, Secretary for War, 77
Women, emancipation of, 139–40
Wordsworth, William, 101, 124, 148–50
Wyndham, William, *see* Grenville, Lord.

York, Frederick Augustus, Duke of (second son of George III), 52, 59

PENGUIN BOOKS

COMPLETE LIST OF PUBLICATIONS TO APRIL, 1938

FICTION *orange covers*

2 A FAREWELL TO ARMS by Ernest Hemingway
3 POET'S PUB by Eric Linklater
4 MADAME CLAIRE by Susan Ertz
8 WILLIAM by E. H. Young
9 GONE TO EARTH by Mary Webb
12 THE PURPLE LAND by W. H. Hudson
13 PATROL by Philip Macdonald
15 FOUR FRIGHTENED PEOPLE by E. Arnot Robertson
16 THE EDWARDIANS by V. Sackville-West
17 THE INFORMER by Liam O'Flaherty
19 THE STRANGE CASE OF MISS ANNIE SPRAGG by Louis Bromfield
23 ESTHER WATERS by George Moore
24 HANGMAN'S HOUSE by Donn Byrne
27 MY MAN JEEVES by P. G. Wodehouse
28 THE OWLS' HOUSE by Crosbie Garstin
39 THE WALLET OF KAI LUNG by Ernest Bramah
41 CROME YELLOW by Aldous Huxley
42 DEATH OF A HERO by Richard Aldington
43 A SAFETY MATCH by Ian Hay
44 A CUCKOO IN THE NEST by Ben Travers
45 THE GLEN O' WEEPING by Marjorie Bowen
47 THE LONELY PLOUGH by Constance Holme
48 A PASSAGE TO INDIA by E. M. Forster
49 THE JUNGLE by Upton Sinclair
50 THE W PLAN by Graham Seton
52 THE SPANISH FARM by R. H. Mottram
53 DUSTY ANSWER by Rosamond Lehmann
54 I AM JONATHAN SCRIVENER by Claude Houghton
57 THE BLACK DIAMOND by Francis Brett Young
59 THREE WIVES by Beatrice Kean Seymour
72 STILL SHE WISHED FOR COMPANY by Margaret Irwin

FICTION *(continued)*

73 MR. WESTON'S GOOD WINE by T. F. Powys
75 DECLINE AND FALL by Evelyn Waugh
76 DANGEROUS AGES by Rose Macaulay
80 THE DAWN OF RECKONING by James Hilton
81 TARKA THE OTTER by Henry Williamson
83 THE POACHER by H. E. Bates
84 LOLLY WILLOWES by Sylvia Townsend Warner
85 SIR ISUMBRAS AT THE FORD by D. K. Broster
86 THESE CHARMING PEOPLE by Michael Arlen
87 GREENERY STREET by Denis Mackail
88 THE GREEN LACQUER PAVILION by Helen Beauclerk
91 GHOST STORIES OF AN ANTIQUARY by M. R. James
92 THE HAMPDENSHIRE WONDER by J. D. Beresford
93 WILD STRAWBERRIES by Angela Thirkell
94 SATURDAY NIGHT AT THE GREYHOUND by John Hampson
95 THE MAN WHO WAS THURSDAY by G. K. Chesterton
96 SELECTED MODERN SHORT STORIES selected by Alan Steele
97 SOME EXPERIENCES OF AN IRISH R.M. by Somerville and Ross
102 YOUTH RIDES OUT by Beatrice Kean Seymour
103 A TALL SHIP by "Bartimeus"
104 DEEP WATERS by W. W. Jacobs
105 MANTRAP by Sinclair Lewis
106 NOW EAST, NOW WEST by Susan Ertz
107 PRIVATE WORLDS by Phyllis Bottome
108 KAI LUNG UNROLLS HIS MAT by Ernest Bramah
109 THE FIDDLER by Sarah Gertrude Millin
112 CHILDREN OF THE EARTH by Ethel Mannin
120 PENGUIN PARADE (I)—New Stories
121–2 LEAN MEN by Ralph Bates (in two volumes)
123 SOLDIERS' PAY by William Faulkner
125 AN INDIAN DAY by Edward Thompson
132 MR. PERRIN AND MR. TRAILL by Hugh Walpole

FICTION *(continued)*

134 CARL AND ANNA by Leonhard Frank
135 SEVEN RED SUNDAYS by Ramon J. Sender
136 VILE BODIES by Evelyn Waugh
138 SELF by Beverley Nichols
140 COLD COMFORT FARM by Stella Gibbons
* PENGUIN PARADE (2)—New Stories

CRIME FICTION *green covers*

5 THE UNPLEASANTNESS AT THE BELLONA CLUB by Dorothy L. Sayers
6 THE MURDER ON THE LINKS by Agatha Christie
34 MR. FORTUNE, PLEASE by H. C. Bailey
58 THE POISONED CHOCOLATES CASE by Anthony Berkeley
61 THE MYSTERIOUS AFFAIR AT STYLES by Agatha Christie
62 THE MISSING MONEYLENDER by W. Stanley Sykes
64 THE FOUR JUST MEN by Edgar Wallace
65 THE MAN IN THE DARK by John Ferguson
78 TRENT'S LAST CASE by E. C. Bentley
79 THE RASP by Philip Macdonald
89 THE DOCUMENTS IN THE CASE by Dorothy L. Sayers (with Robert Eustace)
90 THE SANFIELD SCANDAL by Richard Keverne
98 THE MURDERS IN PRAED STREET by John Rhode
101 MR. JUSTICE RAFFLES by E. W. Hornung
111 THE HOUND OF THE BASKERVILLES by A. Conan Doyle
124 IT WALKS BY NIGHT by John Dickson Carr
127 THE HAVERING PLOT by Richard Keverne
131 TEN MINUTE ALIBI by Anthony Armstrong
137 DEATH AT SWAYTHLING COURT by J. J. Connington

TRAVEL & ADVENTURE *cerise covers*

60 THE DARK INVADER by Captain von Rintelen
66 THE SURGEON'S LOG by J. Johnston Abraham

TRAVEL & ADVENTURE *(continued)*

67 MY SOUTH SEA ISLAND by Eric Muspratt

68 WITH MYSTICS AND MAGICIANS IN TIBET by Alexandra David-Neel

69 } SOME EXPERIENCES OF A NEW GUINEA RESIDENT
70 } MAGISTRATE by C. A. W. Monckton (in two volumes)

82 UNDERTONES OF WAR by Edmund Blunden

99 } THE WORST JOURNEY IN THE WORLD : ANTARCTIC
100 } 1910–1913 by Apsley Cherry-Garrard (in two volumes)

113 THE SECRET OF THE SAHARA by Rosita Forbes

126 TRADER HORN by Alfred Aloysius Horn

133 WATKINS' LAST EXPEDITION by F. Spencer Chapman

139 FLYING DUTCHMAN by Anthony Fokker

BIOGRAPHY & MEMOIRS *dark blue covers*

1 ARIEL by André Maurois

7 TWENTY-FIVE by Beverley Nichols

29–30 AUTOBIOGRAPHY by Margot Asquith

71 CONFESSIONS AND IMPRESSIONS by Ethel Mannin

77 GREY WOLF : MUSTAFA KEMAL by H. C. Armstrong

110 DISRAELI by André Maurois

114–115 FOCH : MAN OF ORLEANS by B. H. Liddell Hart

128 LORD OF ARABIA: IBN SAUD by H. C. Armstrong

MISCELLANEOUS *yellow covers*

116 ON ENGLAND by Stanley Baldwin

118 WHILE ROME BURNS by Alexander Woollcott

119 BILLIARDS AND SNOOKER FOR AMATEUR PLAYERS by Horace Lindrum

129–130 THE WEEK-END BOOK (in two volumes)

DRAMA *red covers*

117 SEVEN FAMOUS ONE-ACT PLAYS

PENGUIN SPECIALS

S1 GERMANY PUTS THE CLOCK BACK by Edgar Mowrer

S2 BLACKMAIL OR WAR by Geneviève Tabouis

S3 MUSSOLINI'S ROMAN EMPIRE by G. T. Garratt

THE PENGUIN SHAKESPEARE

Specially edited for Penguin Books by Dr. G. B. Harrison.

B 1 TWELFTH NIGHT
B 2 HAMLET
B 3 HENRY THE FIFTH
B 4 KING LEAR
B 5 AS YOU LIKE IT
B 6 A MIDSUMMER NIGHT'S DREAM
B 7 THE TEMPEST
B 8 THE MERCHANT OF VENICE
B 9 RICHARD II
B 10 ROMEO AND JULIET
B 11 JULIUS CAESAR
B 12 MACBETH
B 13 HENRY IV, part i
B 14 HENRY IV, part ii
B 15 MUCH ADO ABOUT NOTHING
B 16 OTHELLO
B 17 ANTONY AND CLEOPATRA
B 18 THE SONNETS

Other volumes to follow shortly.

PELICAN BOOKS *light blue covers*

A series of books on science, economics, history, sociology, archæology, etc. Edited by V. K. Krishna Menon ;—*advisory editors :* H. L. Beales, Reader in Economic History, University of London ; W. E. Williams, Secretary, the British Institute of Adult Education ; Sir Peter Chalmers-Mitchell, Secretary of the Zoological Society, London, 1903–35.

A 1, A 2 THE INTELLIGENT WOMAN'S GUIDE TO SOCIALISM, CAPITALISM, SOVIETISM AND FASCISM by Bernard Shaw (in two volumes)

A 3 LAST AND FIRST MEN by Olaf Stapledon

A 4 DIGGING UP THE PAST by Sir Leonard Woolley (*with 32 half-tone plates*)

A 5 A SHORT HISTORY OF THE WORLD by H. G. Wells (*with numerous maps*)

A 6 PRACTICAL ECONOMICS by G. D. H. Cole (*first publication*)

A 7 ESSAYS IN POPULAR SCIENCE by Julian Huxley (*illustrated*)

A 8 THE FLOATING REPUBLIC by Dobrée and Manwaring (*The mutinies at the Nore and Spithead in 1797*)

A 9 A HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH PEOPLE (I) by Elie Halévy

PELICAN BOOKS (*continued*)

A 10 THE MYSTERIOUS UNIVERSE by Sir James Jeans (*with 2 half-tone plates*)

A 11 THE GREAT VICTORIANS (I) edited by H. J. and Hugh Massingham

A 12 THE INEQUALITY OF MAN by J. B. S. Haldane

A 13 LIBERTY IN THE MODERN STATE by Harold J. Laski (*with new introduction*)

A 14 SOCIAL LIFE IN THE INSECT WORLD by J. H. Fabre (*with 15 half-tone plates*)

A 15 THE GROWTH OF CIVILISATION by W. J. Perry (*with several maps*)

A 16 A HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH PEOPLE (II) by Elie Halévy

A 17 A BOOK OF ENGLISH POETRY collected by G. B. Harrison (*a new anthology*)

A 18 AFTER THE DELUGE by Leonard Woolf

A 19 MEDIEVAL PEOPLE by Eileen Power (*with 8 half-tone plates*)

A 20 VISION AND DESIGN by Roger Fry

A 21–2 AN OUTLINE OF THE UNIVERSE by J. G. Crowther (*in two volumes, with numerous illustrations*)

A 23 RELIGION AND THE RISE OF CAPITALISM by R. H. Tawney

A 24 THE PSYCHOPATHOLOGY OF EVERYDAY LIFE by Sigmund Freud

A 25–6 ONLY YESTERDAY by F. L. Allen (*2 volumes, illustrated*)

A 27 UR OF THE CHALDEES by Sir Leonard Woolley (*with 16 half-tone illustrations*)

A 28 CIVILISATION by Clive Bell

A 29 LIMITATIONS OF SCIENCE by J. W. N. Sullivan

A 30 A HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH PEOPLE (III) by Elie Halévy

More volumes to follow.

N.B.

New volumes are continually being added to Penguin and Pelican Books. Please ask your bookseller for the latest list, as further volumes may have been issued since this book was printed. Suggestions of books for inclusion in the series are always welcome.

PELMANISM

PELMANISM is a system of training the mind on scientific lines. It has sometimes been described as "Psychology made popular and practical," but it is something more than that. The system is taught through the medium of fifteen "little grey books" which are accompanied by examination papers. After studying the first of these books, the student answers the accompanying examination paper to the best of his or her ability, and this paper is sent up to an examiner, who marks it and adds appropriate comments. Then the second book is taken, and so the Course continues until the fifteen lessons are completed.

A course of Pelmanism brings out the mind's latent powers and develops them to the highest point of efficiency. It banishes such weaknesses and defects as:

Depression	Mind-Wandering	Weakness of Will
Unnecessary Fears	"Inferiority Complex"	Procrastination
Indefiniteness	Pessimism	Forgetfulness

which interfere with the effective working powers of the mind, and in their place it develops strong, positive, vital qualities such as:

—Optimism	—Will-Power	—Reliability
—Concentration	—Tact	—Decision
—Judgment	—Initiative	—Self-Confidence

By developing these qualities Pelmanism certainly adds to your Efficiency and consequently to your Earning Power.

But what is equally important, Pelmanism increases your happiness and enables you to develop a finer appreciation of the beauties of Nature, the Arts, and Life generally. In a sentence, Pelmanism enables you to live a fuller, richer, happier and more successful existence.

"The Science of Success"—Free

The Pelman System is fully explained in a little book entitled "The Science of Success." The Course is simple and interesting and takes up very little time, and, you can enrol on the most convenient terms. The book will be sent post free on application to-day to—

Pelman Institute

(Established 40 years)

252 Pelman House, Bloomsbury Street, London W.C.1.

PELMAN (OVERSEAS) INSTITUTES: PARIS, 80 Boulevard Haussmann. NEW YORK: 271 North Avenue, New Rochelle. MELBOURNE, 396 Flinders Lane. JOHANNESBURG, P.O. Box 4928. DURBAN, Natal Bank Chambers (P.O. Box 1489). DELHI, 10 Alipore Road. CALCUTTA, 102 Clive Street. AMSTERDAM, Damrak, 68. JAVA, Malabarweg, Malang.

The I.C.S. Offer to Ambitious Men

The International Correspondence Schools, by far the largest and most successful institution in the world devoted to spare-time tuition, can give you a thoroughly sound, practical salary-raising training in the work in which you are employed.

If your present occupation is uncongenial, we can prepare you to make a promising start in a more suitable field.

If you wish to pass some Professional, Technical, Civil Service, or Matriculation Examination, we can coach you in a way that almost guarantees success.

If you wish to develop a " side line " or a hobby, it is probable that we can be of great help to you.

All our Courses are specially arranged to suit the requirements of the man who is able to study in his spare time only and include the services of fully qualified instructors who are entirely familiar with the practice as well as the theory of the subjects they teach.

WRITE TO-DAY FOR FREE BOOKLET
and advice on any one or more of the following subjects:

Accountancy	Dairy Farming	Radio
Advertising	Diesel Engineering	Salesmanship
Aeronautical Eng.	Draughtsmanship	Sanitary Eng.
Agriculture	Electrical Eng.	Scientific Management
Air Conditioning	General Education	Secretarial Work
Architecture	Horticulture	Short-Story Writing
Book-keeping	Insurance	Surveying
Building	Journalism	Television
Chemical Eng.	Marine Eng.	Textile Manuf'g.
Commercial Art	Mechanical Eng.	Works Management
Commercial Training	Mining	Window Dressing
Civil Engineering	Motor Engineering	Woodworking
	Plumbing	

If you have an Examination in view, please state it.

Although highest in quality, I.C.S. Courses cost no more than those of other reputable schools teaching by post.

INTERNATIONAL
CORRESPONDENCE SCHOOLS LTD.
Dept. 119, International Buildings
Kingsway, London, W.C.2

PELICAN BOOKS

A 1	THE INTELLIGENT WOMAN'S GUIDE (1)	Bernard Shaw
A 2	THE INTELLIGENT WOMAN'S GUIDE (2)	Bernard Shaw
A 3	LAST AND FIRST MEN	Olaf Stapledon
A 4	DIGGING UP THE PAST ★	Sir Leonard Woolley
A 5	A SHORT HISTORY OF THE WORLD ★	H. G. Wells
A 6	PRACTICAL ECONOMICS	G. D. H. Cole
A 7	ESSAYS IN POPULAR SCIENCE ★	Julian Huxley
A 8	THE FLOATING REPUBLIC	Dobrée and Manwaring
A 9	A HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH PEOPLE (1)	Elie Halévy
A 10	THE MYSTERIOUS UNIVERSE ★	Sir James Jeans
A 11	THE GREAT VICTORIANS (1)	various authors
A 12	THE INEQUALITY OF MAN	J. B. S. Haldane
A 13	LIBERTY IN THE MODERN STATE	Harold J. Laski
A 14	SOCIAL LIFE IN THE INSECT WORLD ★	J. H. Fabre
A 15	THE GROWTH OF CIVILISATION	W. J. Perry
A 16	A HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH PEOPLE (2)	Elie Halévy
A 17	A BOOK OF ENGLISH POETRY	ed. G. B. Harrison
A 18	AFTER THE DELUGE	Leonard Woolf
A 19	MEDIEVAL PEOPLE ★	Eileen Power
A 20	VISION AND DESIGN	Roger Fry
A 21	AN OUTLINE OF THE UNIVERSE (1) ★	J. G. Crowther
A 22	AN OUTLINE OF THE UNIVERSE (2) ★	J. G. Crowther
A 23	RELIGION & THE RISE OF CAPITALISM	R. H. Tawney
A 24	PSYCHOPATHOLOGY OF EVERYDAY LIFE	Sigmund Freud
A 25	ONLY YESTERDAY (1) ★	Frederick Lewis Allen
A 26	ONLY YESTERDAY (2) ★	Frederick Lewis Allen
A 27	UR OF THE CHALDEES ★	Sir Leonard Woolley
A 28	CIVILIZATION	Clive Bell
A 29	LIMITATIONS OF SCIENCE	J. W. N. Sullivan
A 30	A HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH PEOPLE (3)	Elie Halévy

★ *Illustrated*

PENGUIN BOOKS LTD., HARMONDSWORTH, MIDDLESEX

Complete list of all Penguin Books at end of this volume